



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WASHINGTON ARBITRATION CONFERENCE.

Reported for the ADVOCATE OF PEACE by Miss Martha D. Adams.

(CONCLUDED FROM THE MAY NUMBER)

THIRD SESSION.

Thursday Morning, April 23.

The Conference was called to order at 10 o'clock A. M., by the President.

MR. PARKER of Buffalo offered a resolution on the subject of arbitration, which was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The first speaker who had been announced for the morning was PROFESSOR J. B. MOORE of Columbia College. Professor Moore was prevented from speaking by hoarseness, and the following paper, which he had prepared, was read by Mr. Samuel B. Capen of Boston :

ADDRESS OF PROF. JOHN BASSETT MOORE.

The great end at which the advocates of international arbitration aim is the substitution of judicial methods for methods of violence.

If we go back in the history of the race, we find the relations of individual men much the same as that of nations to-day. Rights were regulated by the strong hand, and men were unwilling to submit their differences to an impartial judgment. An American traveller, in narrating a recent journey through Mongolia and Thibet, tells how, in the latter region, he found men, every now and then, encamped on opposite hills, as if engaged in warfare. They were engaged in litigating disputed titles to land. It was the primitive method of trying individual rights,—the same method that is treated as legitimate to-day among nations.

In the evolution of society, *men* have come to submit their claims and disputes to judicial tribunals. In the last hundred years a strong tendency has been exhibited by certain *nations* to pursue the same course. We have only to point to the arbitrations between the United States and Great Britain for the most remarkable example of that kind. In the last hundred years they have arbitrated many questions of the highest importance, involving considerations of national honor and the determination of essential principles of international conduct. For the last eighty years, every question between these two great nations, which could not be settled by diplomacy, has been disposed of by just and friendly judicial decision.

It is sometimes flippantly said that a permanent system of arbitration would be a good thing if we only could find a perfect arbitrator. It would be as reasonable and as sensible to say that courts would be a good thing if we could only find perfect judges. When we undertake to measure the value of a judicial system, we do not confine ourselves to an estimation of the character and attainment of individual judges, but we consider the effects of the system itself in preserving and improving the complex elements of civilization. The objection to arbitration, on the ground that we cannot find perfect arbitrators, and that force must therefore be employed for the attainment of international justice, becomes ludicrous when we reflect upon the disparity of nations in physical powers and resources, and the many instances in which right has been unscrupulously violated by the strong.

While much has been accomplished by single arbitrations, we desire the establishment of a permanent system. The advantages of such a system are manifold.

In the first place, it would be a means of avoiding disputes. Under present conditions, every question that arises between nations, no matter how simple may be its character, suggests the possibility of the use of force in its settlement. It is left open to the parties in each case to say whether they will or will not resort to judicial methods. The adoption of a permanent system, of arbitration would provide beforehand for a judicial decision, and thus tend to prevent disputes.

In the second place, a permanent system of arbitration would be a means of preventing popular excitements, which have so often been the cause of groundless conflicts between nations. Peoples, instead of thinking first of conflict and thus exciting their own passions, would in time turn more and more to the judicial tribunal, and reason and intelligent investigation would take the place of popular clamor and recrimination.

In the third place, the existence of a permanent system, which might in certain cases combine mediation with arbitration, would afford opportunity for deliberation,—the great panacea for popular excitements in cases in which they might unfortunately break out. It is a remarkable fact that in many cases a nation has precipitated itself into a disastrous war with less deliberation as to consequences than would ordinarily be exhibited by a private individual in the transactions of every-day life. The greatest war of modern times was declared on the strength of a rumor, which a delay of twenty-four hours would have shown to be inaccurate.

In the fourth place, a permanent system of arbitration would be a means of developing international law. The separate and detached arbitrations of the last hundred years have contributed less than could have been hoped for to this end, for the reason that the arbitrators have often been governed by special stipulations that represented the compromises or the successes of diplomacy rather than the general principles of international conduct. Arbitrators proceeding under a permanent system would consider their decisions with reference to their effect on the development of international law, precisely as our domestic tribunals consider the effect of their decisions on the development of municipal law.

What sanction would there be for the enforcement of arbitral decisions? We answer, the most efficient of all sanctions, public opinion. It is a great mistake to suppose that the peace and good order of society are preserved by the penalties prescribed in the criminal codes. So far as such penalties exert an influence, it is by the disgrace attending their imposition, rather than by the physical inconvenience that attend their infliction, that they have their most general operation. Let him who is doubtful as to the execution of the judgments of international arbitration reflect upon the fact that in most cases such judgments have been scrupulously observed, and that in no case have nations, after having agreed to arbitrate a dispute, gone to war about it. Arbitration has brought peace, and "peace with honor." (Applause.)

DR. MERRILL E. GATES, President of Amherst College, Mass., was next introduced and spoke as follows :

ADDRESS OF DR. MERRILL E. GATES.

We are considering a problem which involves the principles of International Law. International Law rests upon the recognition of each state as a personality, in the

judicial sense of the word, "a being to whom we can ascribe a legal will, who can acquire, create and possess rights." Before the law of nations, all states, however they may differ in population, in wealth, in military power, are equally entitled to respect as personalities.

Our problem is to bring two of these national personalities, in their relations with each other, out from the possibility of lapse into brute violence, under the permanent sway of reason and of moral law. Between the two leading nations of the world, close akin and speaking one language, we dare to hope for an end to war,—which at its best is but a "melancholy assertion of right by force." We simply propose between them an agreement to be rational!

It is not a question of sentimental philanthropy which we are considering here to-day. It is a question of our rights, and of the rights of Englishmen. And a question of rights is always a question of our duties and of other men's duties. With every privilege, an obligation! Over against every right, a corresponding duty! And it is both a right and a duty to establish a permanent tribunal for these nations.

As for man, so for states, society is essential. Man cannot exist outside the state. He is in jural relations with others by virtue of his nature as a social being. He can come to his proper development, can use his full powers, only as a member of the state. "*Unus homo, nullus homo.*" Man is never outside the state, cannot by any possibility get outside the state if he would, and has no rights which are not consistent with life in the state, and with the free enjoyment of all their rights by all other persons who live in the state with him. The world has utterly rejected Hobbes's view, that every man is "by nature" in a state of war with all other men, that no man has any rights except by compact;—as Hobbes phrases it in the "*Leviathan*" (I. 14), "Where no covenant hath proceeded, every man hath a right to everything." This is the point of view of the Roman sarcasm, "*homo homini lupus*,"—"man is a wolf to his brother man." On the contrary, we hold and the civilized world believes, that man can be truly *man*, only as he lives in relations of justice and helpful sympathy with his fellow-men. To this end is he rational and social. He *has a right to be in the state*, and in jural relations with his fellows. And in this respect, the state is only "man writ large." The object of the state, said Aristotle, is not merely that men may live, "but that they may live together nobly." As a man has the right to expect and to demand of his fellow-men that they live with him in the state, in a jural society, where his rights are secured to him by rational, moral considerations and by forms and processes of law, without his fighting for them; precisely so a *state* has the right to demand of other states that they come into such jural relations in the society of nations that national rights are secured and guaranteed, and national differences adjusted, without force, without war.

"No man is self-sufficient," said Plato; and we say, no state is or can be self-sufficient. We live too late in the history of the race to be insular in our conception of the state. There is, there must be a society of nations. No state can come to its full development save in that society of states, in jural relations with other states. And no state has any natural rights which are inconsistent with the equal rights of all other states.

For the two most intelligent nations in the world, the

two peoples with the greatest native and acquired aptitude for the politics of peace and the sway of law, it ought to be possible to find a *modus vivendi* which shall maintain justice and shall not threaten a resort to war. This problem between two such states would not seem more difficult than is that of first instituting a state.

"Rational beings," says Kant, "all requiring laws in common for their own preservation, and yet of such a nature that each of them is inclined secretly to except himself from their sway, have to be put under order, and a constitution has to be established among them, so that although they may be antagonistic to one another in their private sentiments, they have yet to be so organized that in their public relations, their conduct will have the same result as if they had no such bad sentiments."

We may be hopeful. We are not proposing a chimerical scheme, or a hopeless problem. Kant affirms that "this problem of the institution of a state, however hard it may appear, would not be insoluble even for a *race of devils*, assuming only that they have intelligence!" And the problem before these two states, England and America, has been solved in the experience of individual citizens in every civilized nation in the world. What individual citizens have learned to do, against the strong impulse of selfish desire, organized bodies of intelligent citizens—states, nations, may learn to do:—if they are reasonable, *will* learn to do!

We are not pessimists. Yet the condition in Europe is painfully like a mere temporary suspension of hostilities. War is delayed, yet it is constantly anticipated. The maintenance of peace by universal preparation for war involves terrible burdens. The industrial interests of the civilized world will not always patiently bear this load. The nations of Europe are not only burdened with the "full-armed soldier upon the back of every laboring man"; but this same burden is laid upon the bowed back of *every woman* who toils for her daily bread; and the white-gloved hand of the martinet, as he lolls in his camp, is reached down to take the black bread of starvation out of the mouths of the little children!

This burden makes the voters of the world thoughtful. Never before has war been compelled to give so strict an account of itself. Never before has there been so thoughtful and stern a challenge of its "reason for being." The world is gloriously threatened with a great revolutionary outburst of brotherly feeling between the nations, which will insist upon an end to war!

And the educated laboring men of the world are behind this demand; and the children who are trained in our public schools are behind us! More and more we may look to the rule of ideas to bring about this reform.

A hundred years ago, in deprecating the prevalence of war, the philosopher Kant wrote: "The Great Powers are never put to shame before the judgment of the common people, as they are only concerned about one another." "But it is the people, on whom the cost falls," and "when the decision of the question of war falls to the people, neither the desire of aggrandizement nor mere verbal injuries will be likely to induce them" to declare war. "The evils arising from constant wars by which the states seek to reduce or subdue each other must bring them at last" to an agreement "For Perpetual Peace!"

A hundred years ago, Kant's essay in favor of "Perpetual Peace" was published, just after the Peace of Basle had recognized the French Republic. Prussia had

retired from the coalition against France and had guaranteed the neutrality of the other North German states. In the interval of peace and hope, this essay of Kant gave to the world "the first clear adumbration of the great doctrines of Federation and Universal Right which are now stirring the hearts of the peoples." His hopeful prophecies of peace were followed by the grim comment of the Napoleonic wars now in their after-glow of magazine notoriety. But while this outburst of militarism seemed to controvert the philosopher's view, the logic of time and of tendency was with him. It is astonishing to note as you read this classic essay, how much that then seemed optimistic prophecy, is now accomplished fact.

The history of the century should confirm every man of us in his belief in the possibility of changes for the better in international relations.

Certainly they are far from perfect, to-day. Thoughtful patriots in every land, and especially in England and America, are planning for their betterment. And nowhere in the world can you now find thoughtful men who believe that the road to improved conditions is to be found through more frequent wars, more easily provoked, more lightly entered upon. On the contrary, society has always made its advances by appeals to reason, to common-sense, to conscience, instead of to brute force. Progress in civilization always means the substitution of law for violence. Progress leads straight to a permanent tribunal for the peaceful and just decision of international differences.

No careful student of the history of civilization can fail to believe in "the progressive elaboration of right." Gradually the institutions of men come to embody more and more fully their highest conceptions of right. We see more clearly, with each decade, that the relation of enmity, of hostility between states, is, and should be, a *transitory* relation. All changes in the laws of nations recognize this more fully with each new convention. Those who still seek to defend war upon rational grounds will freely admit that in the best view of it, "war is an accident of the imperfect development of right." From its very nature it is a means poorly adapted to the end of securing justice and maintaining order. We need a *permanent* system for adjusting differences and rendering rights secure. It is of the very essence of the terms, not that force should be needed to give validity to rights, but that rights, the *Right*, can alone give true power to a nation and maintain rational force.

Nations should be able to avoid "the chances of war," as we significantly call war's arbitrations, and to live under the permanent sway of justice expressed in law—in law obeyed because it is right and reasonable,—in decisions by permanent tribunals deferred to because they are rationally constituted, are provided for in advance of the differences to be adjudicated by them—in short, because they are *permanent*, as righteousness is permanent. We believe that such tribunals can be established between states, as they have been between individuals in the same state. We believe that they will be respected and deferred to when established, not from fear of physical force to be held over men's heads from behind the judge's bench, but because they will utter that Law whose "seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world." States will obey these decisions, as the majority of men obey the law, without a thought of the penalties that would follow its infringement, because they feel and say to their convictions of right, to Duty:

"Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
And the most ancient heavens, through Thee are fresh and strong."

Our demand for the establishment of a permanent tribunal between nations, and our confidence that it will command the allegiance of states, rest on our belief in the permanency of principles of justice, on our faith in the growing morality and conscientiousness of states as *persons*, in the moral world.

The modern state differs notably from the mediæval state. Custom, tradition, precedent blindly followed, shaped the mediæval state. The modern state consciously shapes its own life, according to principle, in the light of reason. The ancient state recognized no restraint outside of or above its own will, save as it was met by external force. The modern state, recognizing international law, regards all states as jural personalities, equal in rights before that law. The entire development of that type, the *modern National State*, which now leads and dominates the world, has been such as to dispose it more and more constantly to *pay regard to moral law*, to considerations of justice.

Such a state as Great Britain, the United States or Germany is in a high sense a personality. It is something more than the sum of its citizens, something different from a mere collection of laws and institutions, something not to be fully identified with its executive, legislative and judicial officers and methods. It is an organism. It has a vital force, a life which takes victorious possession of all its material elements and dominates them. The national will is something in a true sense different from the sum of the wills of a majority of its citizens, although they give bent and color to it. Interest in the whole, co-operation with all, modifies the thought and the will of each of the constituent parts. The spirit of the nation, the vital force of the nation, cannot be fully accounted for by summing the series of the vital force and the spirit of its individual citizens. Not simply for the assumptions of international law, but actually, in the arena of the world's causal activities, the modern national state answers to the essential definition of a personality. It has "self-conscious being, self-directed knowledge, self-determined activity." As a personality, it is its appointed and its chosen destiny to be controlled more and more fully by principles, by ideas, by moral law. The representative democratic state grows more consciously reasonable from year to year; and as states become more reasonable, they demand more insistently that in their internal life permanent tribunals shall replace mob-violence.

Is it too much to ask, that these, the two foremost nations of the world, take up into their national life and embody in their international methods and relations, the deepest convictions and the noblest moral feelings of their most thoughtful citizens? The state is "an organization for the perfection of public life in public matters." The national state is an advancing personality, existing that through it a nation may express its spirit, its convictions, may work out its life, its appointed problems in the forward movement of the race. The national state gives expression to the aims, the spirit, the will of the people of a nation. It is modified in harmony with the national growth, with the ever-loftier standards that should mark the advancing civilization of the nation.

That conscience of the state which is the resultant of the conscience of its citizens, demands of the United

States and England that they now give to the world a notable peace lesson, by the establishment of a permanent tribunal for the settlement of international differences.

Why is a permanent system especially desirable?

First, because it is of the very nature of human law and its administration, that it brings permanent, unchanging principles of justice to bear upon the changing circumstances and conditions of human life. To the clashing desires and the changing personalities which appear before the tribunal, it applies the "canon" of the law (which means the straight-edge ruler), the permanent principle of justice and morality. And because there has been this satisfying touch between the transient claim and the eternal verities as they govern the permanent tribunal, men are content to abide by decisions thus reached. By its nature, war as an arbiter of justice gives no such solid and enduring results. When a treaty of peace has checked a war, "each nation remains in a state of hostility to the other without being subject to the reproach of injustice, since each party is the exclusive judge in its own case." "Even the favorable issue of war in a victory will not decide a question of right," says Kant. A personality demands for its guidance a principle; and when two personalities have rival claims, lest selfishness sway the judgment of each, justice demands that the principle be applied to the case not by either of the immediately interested parties, but by a tribunal especially designated *in advance* for the application of principles to the claims of differing personalities. It has been found wise that the form of the tribunal be permanent; not merely because it is true that with added experience the persons who themselves apply the principles of justice will be able to apply them more wisely and fairly; but because contestants are readier to submit their rival claims to a tribunal if it is organized in advance, and if it has been tested and has shown itself fit for its work. What has been found to be fitting and wise as a provision for the settlement of differences between individuals, will be found to be wise and fitting as a provision for the settlement of differences between two great Christian nations. England and the United States have inherited the same system of common law and a great wealth of ethical convictions and jural principles in common; and each nation wishes to promote the civilization of the world and the maintenance of liberty. And we Anglo-Saxons love a *liberty* not fluent in phrases and fleeting, but *established in permanent institutions under the sway of law!*

Some means are so obviously adapted to evil results that we know them as accursed when we see them. No proposed good can justify the choice of means so bad. Such is war, as a voluntarily chosen means for securing justice.

But there are other means and measures which are so obviously fitted for the attainment of *good ends*, that they seem to have in their very genius something of the good which is sought as an end through their use, so directly and inevitably do they tend to its attainment. Their use is in itself an education to men and races. Is not a permanent international tribunal for our English-speaking nations such a measure?

The good governments of the world are not happy accidents! No one object which men have proposed to themselves has called for such long-continued, strenuous, yet ennobling and beneficent effort as has the establish-

ment of liberty in institutions and laws. There is no battle-monument in the world so eloquent to me as some of those phrases of our English common law, every one of which speaks of warfare carried on, generation after generation, by fearless ancestors of ours, to vindicate some form of law, to make the principles of justice unassailable thereafter. "My house is my castle,"—how many Englishmen, in the days of the plundering barons, died to establish that principle of institutional liberty! "To get twelve honest men in a box," one of the greatest of Englishmen has said, is "the whole object of the English constitution,"—so vital to the spirit of liberty is the right of trial by jury! Even the common phrases which we have thoughtlessly on our lips,—such a phrase as *habeas corpus*, in its history declares, "There shall be no such thing as oppression at the caprice of monarchs, which puts men into the living sepulchres in the Bastille by *lettres de cachet*,—such as 'puts men out of the way' when their opposition is too strong for the king!" This phrase, *habeas corpus*, stands as a monument of our fearless Anglo-Saxon ancestors; and recall if you can without a thrill of pride and joy the long contest which preceded and has accompanied the use of that simple legal form, the protection of the unjustly imprisoned, in which the justice, as servant of the law he applies, says to the officer, "do thou have the body of this prisoner before me, on a given day, to show cause why he should be detained prisoner"! Where is there a nobler battle-monument to victories won for Liberty?

This permanence in methods of law is dear to the Anglo-Saxon heart. And therefore I look with great hopefulness toward the establishment of such a tribunal between England and ourselves; not because of any sentimental reliance on the fact that we are "cousins" (we have learned, to our cost, how little that is worth, in times of excitement), but because there is bred in the bone and transmitted from father to son this belief in permanency in legal methods and customs (as against militarism and against false and wordy idealism), in every Anglo-Saxon man! And we of the English-speaking races should vindicate our in-born faith in law, by leading the world in plans for international arbitration!

It may be urged that the method of occasional arbitration, to be provided for by special agreement, as special cases arise, between England and the United States, for the past eighty years has given results so good that it is best to "let well enough alone." There are very serious considerations, however, vividly present to the memory of all who are here, which should lead us "in time of peace to prepare"—*not for war, but for making war impossible!* Some permanent plan should be devised, and should be embodied in a treaty obligation, so that when a difference arises, that difference may be considered and discussed without the feeling that two nations may at last go to war about it, but with the certainty that if diplomatic negotiations do not settle it, it will go upon its merits to a tribunal, fairly constituted, in advance of the exigency, and without reference to the especial case to be decided.

The question whether differences shall be settled by war or by peaceful methods, while it is no longer so entirely an open question as it used to be when war was declared at the caprice of a monarch or his favorite adviser, is still too frequently an open question. The decision of so important a matter should never depend upon passion or caprice. The provision of a permanent tribunal will tend directly to put an end to the sway of

passion and caprice in this matter. In private life, if there were no court, no judge, no method of procedure, unless in the heat of passion and under the pressure of selfish interest the contestants should choose to say, "We will name arbitrators to decide between us," we can imagine (but we can hardly exaggerate) the multitude of angry quarrels that would spring up! As it is, the knowledge that the means for a legal settlement of questions are already provided, is in itself enough to preserve the peace in society; and so it would be between states.

The permanent tribunal would also prevent the accumulation of a multitude of unsatisfied claims and unredressed grievances, no one of which seems quite important enough to be the cause of a war. Yet we have often seen in history that the accumulation of such unredressed grievances leads to intense bitterness, and finally to a war out of all proportion to the insignificance of the event which at last precipitates it. It is well to have a permanent tribunal always available. Otherwise grievances accumulate like the overhanging mass of ice and snow threatening and foretelling the avalanche which at last so slight a shock as the shout of a child or the firing of a pistol starts on its destructive down-rush.

In its educating effect upon the parties concerned and upon all who observe their disagreement, it makes a vast difference whether the case opens with the assertion, "I am going to get the best of you by force, if I can," or with the quiet assertion, "I am going to test your rights and mine, by prescribed forms of law, before the tribunal already provided for such cases."

Whenever an international episode leads to a demand by one state which the other does not believe to be just, war is now the scarcely concealed threat; and for this reason there is always a rapid generation of intensely hostile feeling, from the simple fact that the state which is aggrieved feels that *nothing except war* can prevent its suffering a gross imposition. You can understand the tendency in human nature which shows itself in this fact, if you have ever tried to keep perfectly cool in manner, even in tone, and calm and sweet at heart in your feeling toward a man who in the discussion of a question of right between you and himself, raises his heavy cane above your head and threatens to strike you while you argue! Until the nations come out from under the rule of brute-violence, the wonder is, not that wars are so frequent, but that they are not more frequent. Their infrequency, as international affairs are now managed, shows that nations are ruled by conscience, by reason. Rational modes of settling international differences must come into use as men become more entirely rational, more truly civilized, more obedient to their moral convictions.

With objections to our plan which are based upon the praise of war in itself, in Hegel's words, "as the state of things in which the moral life of nations is preserved by action;" or with the praise of war, in its alleged development of Christian manhood, by the "fighting parsons" such as Charles Kingsley and Dr. Mozley, we will not now concern ourselves. May we not all admit that out of the terrible anguish and the barbarous and needless suffering occasioned by war, the Ruler of the Universe brings something of good? But the man who advocates war as *in itself* a good, and as a means of developing Christian manhood, must get his ideal of Christ from some other source than the Gospel.

Perhaps the most serious difficulty which statesmen anticipate in their attempts to carry out the plan before

us, is indicated in such words as these: "As the mutual relations between states are founded upon their separate sovereignty," as "their mutual rights are not guaranteed by any superior authority," "there is no supreme judge and sovereign arbiter between states," "their rights depend upon their separate wills." It is alleged, and with force, that the code of international law proposed by jurists "has never had the full obligatory force of law, properly so called, because it has lacked adequate coercive sanction." It is feared that "a state which has once entered into possession of its powers so as to be subject to no external law, will not bring itself to submit to the judgment of other states as to how it should seek to maintain its rights in relation to them." Since respect for law seems to imply punishment if law is defied, it is felt that there should be, behind the law, enough of force to inflict penalty if the law is broken. In the minds of many, lack of faith in the feasibility of a plan such as we are considering comes from the fear that without coercive sanction the decisions of such a tribunal would not be obeyed, and that any measure which should look toward the generation and employment of the power to punish broken agreements or infringements of international law, would imply a power superior to national sovereignty, and so would break down national spirit and national independence, and would tend either to anarchy or to a world-empire.

But such a permanent tribunal as we propose would not be antagonistic to the spirit of national unity and national independence. Rather, it would fortify a true and just national spirit. The personality of the nation, like the personality of a man, *is fortified* by bringing it under the sway of Reason, by pouring into it that regard for justice, for principles, for the moral law, which is the life-breath of personality for men, and of strong nationality for a state. We have passed that period in the development of the human race, when the recognition of facts, the perception of truth, the just consideration of the rights of others, can be regarded as dangerous for a man or a nation. Our hope contemplates no world-empire. We believe in the mission of the national state, through which national characteristics and national life find vigorous expression, and do their appointed work in the world. All attempts at a world-nation have failed and must fail. But while we limit our present efforts to a plan for co-operation between two nations which are closely akin, we are not afraid of the poet's vision of

"The parliament of man, the federation of the world."

While we have the Anglo-Saxon aversion to coming under the sway of extreme theories, let us not fear a right and wise measure simply because it approves itself to the philosopher as reasonable and philosophically sound, and to the poet as beautiful and full of promise. The truth is, that political science is *the practical science of righteousness in society*. Politics is applied morality. High politics are "the crown of social morality." "A true political philosophy," says Kant, "cannot advance a step without first paying homage to the principles of morality." It is the duty of the statesman (who is the moral politician) in the measures he advocates to make constant approximation to the end of attaining the very best conceivable order of national and international life and relations. The peaceful settlement of international differences by a permanent tribunal, will be not merely advantageous in itself for the nations concerned, but it is in itself a method, and it presupposes a state of affairs among the

nations, which considerations of right imperatively demand of us that we seek to bring about.

And for its establishment and maintenance we look not to any military force behind the tribunal for the enforcement of its decisions, but rather to the mightiest force known in the history of the race, to the power of Ideas, to the power of Conscience! The intelligent, moral convictions of England and of the United States are to be the generator of the moral dynamic which is needed to enforce the decrees of such a tribunal; and these conscientious convictions of our race in both its great political divisions, we may implicitly trust. More and more fully do we trust them! It is a hundred years this spring since the birth of that great educational reformer, Horace Mann, who declared fifty years ago, "the greatest discovery man has ever made, is the common school." With all due allowance for his excessive admiration of that particular instrumentality for the diffusion of ideas and the promotion of popular intelligence, the whole history of the last century sums itself up in the steadily growing determination of the world to educate the people, and to entrust to the whole people of every nation the ultimate sovereign power. And with this political tendency of the century, England and America, the leading states of the world, are content. We have faith in it, not because in the last analysis of political affairs the greater physical and military strength lies with the majority of voters; but because conscience and reason more and more manifestly govern the majority of the voters, as the majority of the common people are better educated.

Do we not to-day trust the conscience of the common people to do right, more willingly than we trust the conscience of the diplomats?

It is of the very essence of our proposal that it gives room for what Lincoln taught the world to respect, "the sober, second thought of the people." Instead of sudden and disastrous action upon such quick "wave impulses" of passion as that bristling for war which for a few days swept over our people in the week just before the Christmas chimes last rang out the tidings of "peace on earth, good will to men,"—we propose a method, always ready, for the calm, dispassionate, judicial consideration of the rights involved, while this "sober, second thought" of the people may be taking form. "A word and a blow" is not our conception of the method of the mature and reasonable man. Much less is it the way to secure justice, when war thus precipitated means death to thousands or to hundreds of thousands, agony to family life, ruin in social and commercial life, and fresh lessons, to the on-looking world, in barbarous wilfulness on the part of "Christian nations."

Self-preservation should lead these two foremost nations of the civilized world to take the action we propose, were there no higher motive. Unless we act in this matter as we ought to act, there are forces of undisciplined humanity on the earth that will act as they ought not to act! Uncivilized nations may yet change the history of the world and the face of civilization, unless civilized nations are true to the reign of ideas, to the reign of law and morality! We have been accustomed to feel that civilization could never again be threatened by the invasions of savage hordes.

But when we see how little of true civilization, how little of fitness for self-government, is requisite, before the hordes of China and Russia and Central Africa are able to avail themselves of the latest scientific engineering of destruc-

tion,—who shall say that with the vast excess of "stark naked human strength" which is theirs, reinforced by such engineering as their manipulative skill and their power to underlive us and to undersell our labor, may give to them, these nations, unless restrained by ideas, may not yet so overrun the world as to change its aspect as 'twas changed when the old Roman Empire disappeared before the barbarous Northern invaders?

International politics of the last few months, as they have displayed themselves at Constantinople and St. Petersburg and Peking and in Africa, make thoughtful men serious. If we are to welcome and not to dread the inevitable oncoming, into the arena of world-politics, of these races, innumerable in population, how important it is that we show them in advance that civilization means regard for law, and not appeals to brute strength.

"Might and Right rule the world," says Joubert, "but Might only until Right is ready." And the belief that England and the United States are now to lead the way towards those higher levels of international law and international life when the Titan Might, though in the past he may have been often so controlled by the inexorable laws of Jove that he has done Jove's will, shall at last give way to Reason, to the golden sway of Right, is the light that breaks over our horizon as we meet here.

The progress of the human race is not a meaningless and flattering phrase. The philosophy of history clearly shows this progress. The evolution of successive orders of life in nature about us shows it. Progress to the higher form, entire subordination or disuse of the lower methods and lower organs, is the law of life as revealed in animal evolution. There is progress. The orders of animals where dominion lay in the stomach, and in the lower organs and passions, have given way to higher orders, where dominion is in the brain, in the will, in the conscience which fortifies the will! The history of civilization shows clearly the same law of progress. In the evolution of the state, the student of political science is forced to see the gradual substitution of the conscientious personality of the whole people in the state, for the fickle personality of the ruler who used to speak of the state as his appanage and employ its powers in war at his own caprice. We may be entirely confident that the power of reason is to be stronger, with each successive decade, in world-politics. In the international relations of states, there cannot be stability until the pyramid stands on its base. That which is unrighteous, that which involves the prevalence of violence and force instead of reason and law, is by its very nature unstable and must give place to the permanent, the eternal, the right.

We have faith in the establishment of this reform in international measures which we advocate, not because of any weak confidence that progress goes on of itself, apart from the efforts of men, but because we believe that by the more general intelligence which prevails among men, and through the popular and representative forms of government which now lead the civilization of the world, the spread and the rule of ideas is more possible than ever before; and because it is our conviction that a larger proportion of our race than ever before is to-day governed by the law of duty voluntarily accepted and applied by the individual citizen!

The conscientious citizens of the United States and of England, loving liberty embodied in law and institutions, will insist upon a Permanent International Tribunal, in the interest of Justice and Peace!

MR. ANDERSON of Pittsburg presented a resolution on arbitration, which was ordered to be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

MR. SKINNER of Albany: I ask the indulgence of this Conference for a moment to present a matter for the consideration of the Committee on Resolutions. I take pride in alluding to the fact that the New York State Bar Association, composed of men eminent in the legal profession, has taken steps along the line to be considered by this Conference. On the 12th of last February, the anniversary of the birth of that great patriot and statesman Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday was then first celebrated as a public holiday in New York State, the Bar Association had their first meeting. They laid their plans and appointed committees to consider the very question which this Conference is called to consider. After careful preparation they have submitted a memorial to the President of the United States during the present week.

In view of the great work for which this Conference was called, in view of the feeling throughout our country which is in accord with the spirit of this Conference, in view of the patriotic spirit which has actuated the New York State Bar Association, I ask permission that this memorial to the President, with the accompanying report, be published as a part of my remarks, in order that it may be preserved as a matter of reference to all interested in this question. With this request I submit a resolution to be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Upon motion, it was voted that the report presented by Mr. Skinner be printed in the Proceedings of the Conference.

MR. MASTERS of Illinois offered a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

THE PRESIDENT: In connection with what President Gates has so happily said, referring to the prophecy begun so many years ago, I ask your indulgence to read a short extract from a sermon delivered in this city on the 3rd day of March, 1889, by a clergyman who has spent his whole life, since his boyhood, in deeds of benevolence and in promoting social progress. He is now venerable in years, and I hope he is somewhere in the audience to hear me:

"The Twentieth Century applies the word of the Prince of Peace to international life. 'No war nor battle sound' was heard when he was born. And as he advances, the echoes of such sounds are farther and farther away. The wisdom of statesmen will devise the solution, which soldiers and people will accept with thankfulness.

"The beginning will not be made at the end of war, but in some time of peace. The suggestion will come from one of the Six Great Powers. It will be from a nation which has no large permanent military establishment. That is to say, it will probably come from the United States. This nation, in the most friendly way, will propose to the other great powers to name each one jurist, of world-wide fame, who, with the other five, shall form a permanent Tribunal of the highest dignity. Everything will be done to give this Tribunal the honor and respect of the world. As an International Court, it will be organized without reference to any especial case under discussion.

"Then it will exist. Its members may prepare themselves as they choose for its great duty. Timidly at first, and with a certain curiosity, two nations will refer to

it some international question, not of large importance, which has perplexed their negotiations. The tribunal will hear counsel and will decide. The decision will be the first in a series which will mark the great victory of the Twentieth Century. Its simplicity, its dignity and its good sense will commend it to the world. Again it will be clear that those who look on always understand a game better than the players do. That first decision will be accepted. The next question will be of more importance; the next of even more; and thus, gradually, the habit will be formed of consulting this august Tribunal in all questions before states. More and more will men of honor and command feel that an appointment to serve on this Tribunal is the highest human dignity.

"Of such a Tribunal, the decisions, though no musket enforce them, will be one day received of course. It will be as to-day in any two States of America the great decisions are received of that great American court, indeed Supreme, from whose methods the Great Tribunal of the New Century will have to study its procedure." (Applause, and cries of "Dr. Hale!")

REV. EDWARD E. HALE, of Massachusetts, presented a resolution, which was ordered to be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The next speaker introduced was REV. J. W. BACHMAN, of Tennessee, who spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. BACHMAN.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Conference: The great Ruler of the governments of this world, infinite in wisdom and power, said of his own peculiar government at one time, "My people perish for lack of knowledge." They were uninstructed, and therefore they went downward. One of the great things this Conference is to do, is to give knowledge to our own people, and to the world. I was impressed in last evening's exercises, as well as in this morning's addresses, with the instruction that is being given to us. Let us understand that one of the great advantages of a permanent system of arbitration is that arbitration settles matters. In all the fourscore cases which have already been arbitrated, there has been no difficulty. If the old adage be true, which let him who can disprove, that "things are never settled till they are settled right," then arbitration by a permanent court will be of immense advantage to the world. (Applause.) We will settle things right, and go forward, not having to go back and re-arbitrate and re-settle.

Arbitration means the triumph of justice and truth. There is no greater difficulty in a man's pathway than a lie or a deception. He may deceive his fellow-men for a little while by covering over, but to-morrow there will be a resurrection of that lie, and he must bury it again. But truth, once brought out and established, remains alive and strong.

A system of arbitration will give to the Anglo-Saxon race, whose position is the proudest in the world, a double power. When you have joined forces, then what triumph, what advances can be made! What commander has not felt on the field in times that are past, "O, that such a division, such a force, were here, that I might make the advance and gain the victory!" Let the great powers of the world, the English-speaking peoples, combine, and they will widen and deepen the channel of civilization, of constitutional government, of religious liberty. They will become a power which the world will respect. Prob-

ably you will remember an incident of which I have read. Once an American by adoption, an Englishman by birth, was condemned to be shot by one of the governments of this world. Our consuls in that country sought to have him fairly tried, but unsuccessfully. And on the day of execution, when there was no other resort, the representatives of these two great countries took the flags of their nations, and as the prisoner stood before the platoon to be shot, they stepped forward, and wrapping each the flag of his country around him, turned to the officer in command, and said, "Fire if you dare! And bring upon you the wrath of two nations that will sweep you from the face of the earth!" (Applause.) Such a union as we advocate will give added power, added strength, to the forces of good, and the forces of civilization.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, and I say it modestly, and thankfully. It has pleased the great Ruler of the Universe to put the English-speaking people in the front, in the little world where we dwell. When one of old would claim the laurel wreath, some one asked him, "What profit will that be to you?" He said, "The privilege of fighting in the front rank!" We have obtained, under the good providence of God, the laurel wreath of civilization, of government, of religious freedom; and we are entitled to stand and fight in the front rank, not for selfish honor or glory, but for the good of the world and the honor of our God. That rank imposes obligations. "*Noblesse oblige*." What was it put the white plume of Navarre always in the front? Every student of history knows that when that white plume danced along the line of battle, it was because he was what he was. He was under obligations to his fellow-men to do great things for them. God has put us in the front rank among the nations of the earth, and with that he has laid on us great obligations. It is said in the old Book which we all revere, that it is not for kings to do wickedly. It is not for us, as an enlightened and civilized people, to hold to the savagery and barbarism of the past.

It is said, and wisely, of the individual, and may be said of the nation likewise, that example is better than precept. If we adopt this system of permanent arbitration, then we shall give an example to every nation upon the face of the earth, that will be a blessing and a benediction to them. We owe it to mankind to give them the highest and the best example that can be given. (Applause.)

When invited to this Conference, I said, "These are matters that ought to receive the attention of every man of peace, every minister of the Gospel, every lover of his country, and I will lay down my work and go." We ought to do, and to do quickly, such things as we have to do here. There are few of us that are young. The men of this Conference know what other men do not know. We have known it in the darkest days of our experience. We have known what the young men coming after us will not know, what our sons and our daughters can never know, — and I thank God that they never can! We know what war means! We know what destruction and sorrow and trouble and remediless ruin come out of war. O, we know! We know, in the memory of the days that are gone, how war breaks peace, breaks homes, breaks hearts, breaks everything that human beings hold dear! We know how it leaves behind it a gloom and destruction that it takes more than a quarter of a century to repair! Let us, as God shall give us help, provide that there shall be peace, — peace at least among these two great

powers which will eventually, as I believe, control the earth. (Applause.)

The matters before the Conference ought not merely to be published in our papers or pamphlets, but they ought to be pressed home upon the law-making powers of our country and of England at once, that they may be accomplished without delay. I remember that that great seer and statesman, Ward Thomas, fifty-six years ago, in a semi-diplomatic paper published in England, said that the times were coming when there should be conflicts, not for territory, not for commerce, conflicts of ideas, a conflict between absolutism on the one side and constitutional government and civil liberty on the other, and that Old England, from her position, would stand for constitutional liberty and for religious freedom. And when that great issue should come, as he believed it would come, England would be pressed and straightened more than at any time in her past history. But if at that time she could reach her hand across the Atlantic and grasp the hand of her great daughter on this side, there would be no need to fear for the result of the issue. (Applause.) And so we shall, with the help of God, stand united, not only to settle our own difficulties, but for the peace and harmony of the world, for the advancement of civilization, and for the bringing on of that time when peace and righteousness shall reign.

MR. CROSBY, of Maine, and MR. LOVE, of Pennsylvania, offered resolutions on the subject of arbitration, which were ordered to be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

HON. JOHN J. VALENTINE, of California, had been announced as the next speaker, but was detained by the meeting of the Committee on Resolutions. The Chair accordingly invited remarks from any of the delegates present:

MR. SMALLEY, of Minnesota: It is far from my purpose to project any discord into the harmony which happily characterizes this body. I feel, however, like entering a dissent to a certain tendency of thought which, if I am not mistaken, I observed in one of the addresses of last evening. That tendency was to hold that we, in the United States, should welcome cordially the extension of the power of the other great English-speaking nation in all parts of the globe, as an advance of civilization; but that we should at the same time limit our own strength and influence strictly within our own borders. It seemed to be the opinion then expressed that we should be glad that our sister nation has occupied the great Dutch colonies in the southern seas, and taken possession of the Dutch settlements in South Africa, and holds with the strongest fortress in the world the southern point of Spain, and occupies in the Mediterranean, around which she has no contiguous territory, an immense island fortress; that all these processes of English statesmanship, which have carried the drum-beat of that country around the globe, should be welcomed; that the growing of boundary lines here and there should draw from us no protest; but that for us to establish ourselves as a sea-power among the nations of the globe is jingoism. I desire, coming from the heart of the continent, and from a state from which the waters run to the Gulf of Mexico, to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and to the frozen waters of Hudson Bay, to say that I do not believe that it is the sentiment of the great American people that our mission of the globe is confined strictly within our own territorial borders. (Applause.)

MR MAY, of Philadelphia, inquired if the subject on which the gentleman was speaking was germane to the object of the meeting.

THE CHAIR expressed the opinion that the remarks of the gentleman were fairly germane to the general principles involved in the subject of permanent arbitration, especially in view of the discussion of the previous evening, to which he had particularly addressed himself.

MR. SMALLEY: It is because we are a young and a combative nation that we desire to establish, with the second great power on this globe, the principles of international arbitration. It is not because we desire to retire from the race for commercial supremacy over the globe. We do not wish to restrain our efforts within our own borders. We wish to carry our commerce and manufactures all over the world. It is not jingoism to desire to accept the friendly association of the Sandwich Islands. I remember, to my own regret, that I participated, as a journalist here in Washington, in the movement to restrain the administration of President Grant from obtaining a naval station in the West Indies. I recant now everything that I said then. I believe that England offers us a shining example, and that we are, in the next century, to carry our flag beside hers, as a great civilizing influence, all around this globe. (Applause.)

We cannot, at this stage of the world's progress, carry out this mission of ours,—a mission of commerce and civilization and of the extension of the principles of the right of man to self-government, without becoming a sea-power. It is a dream of the future to think that nations are going to lay down their arms and dwell together as brethren in the church. As long as other nations strengthen their influence over the globe we are bound to maintain ourselves and to build ourselves up as a sea-power. I think people of all parties in this country look with approbation upon the efforts of Congress to strengthen the American navy. (Applause, and cries of "No, no!")

The government of Great Britain has recently constructed a vast magazine of war upon our Northwestern frontier. She dominates the entrance to the great inland seas. She has obtained for herself an access by canals for her gunboats to our Great Lakes, and we have done nothing to provide for ourselves a channel to those lakes for our defence. Now, *because* we are the two great ambitious commercial powers of the globe, therefore, we want,—we greatly want—such a system of arbitration as will act as a check upon popular clamor and prejudice.

I stand here, gentlemen, as an old newspaper man, to say that I think that one of the very best results, one of the very best modifying influences, that could be exerted by such a tribunal would be upon the press. We all know that, just as soon as any friction or appearance of international difficulties appears, the newspapers begin to irritate and agitate the public mind,—and why? Because it is the unusual, the strange, the combative, that makes the paper interesting. James Gordon Bennett, Sr., used to say to the young men whom he employed upon his paper, that there were four great elements of human character that must always be kept in view in managing a newspaper, and the first of these was combativeness. It is combativeness which the newspapers constantly appeal to, and which is our great danger in case of any international difficulties. If we can succeed in establishing such a tribunal which shall act before the newspapers get us by the ears, the whole question passes out of the

range of journalistic discussion and goes into that of calm judicial consideration. (Applause.) Do not think that I am opposed to the principle of this convention. In my section of the country we are very heartily in favor of it. We have a long boundary line on our northern frontier; we have great commercial cities; we desire to remain in peace and brotherhood, and we are here to aid you most heartily, not only in the formation of resolutions asserting general principles, but in laying down a plan of arbitration. We believe that such a plan should be laid down. It may not be final, it may not be the best, but let us put forth a plan that can be discussed by the journals and the statesmen of the two countries. (Applause.)

MR. SAYLOR, of Indiana: I believe that one of the most important advantages of international arbitration is that it becomes an international institution,—not an international device, temporary and uncertain, but an international institution. An institution among a people is a part of a people. If we can establish, in our good fortune, an institution international in its character, it will become a part of the international life of the nations involved in it. We all recognize the advantages commercially of international institutions. We recognize the advantages of the transmission of intelligence from one part of the world to another; and by treaty we have brought that under the protecting influence of an institution. By acts of Congress and of Parliament literature has been so protected that an author in one country is substantially an author in both countries. (Applause.) If we can be so fortunate as to succeed in establishing a court, which is an institution,—we may call it, indeed, the citadel of all institutions, the retreat which we all seek when we are in distress,—such an international court would be a crowning manifestation of the activities of justice. It would become as the very fibre, the very life, of the peoples who are parties to it. (Applause.)

MR. SCHURZ: Expecting that Mr. Saylor would say something with reference to the utterances of the speaker who preceded him, I sat still. I get up now to say a word with reference to that. I suppose Mr. Smalley referred particularly to Mr. Atkinson's speech last night. When we speak of establishing the United States as a great sea-power, it is fit that we consider maturely and coolly what it means. If the United States is to be a great sea-power, we must have a naval armament, at least equal to that of England. Gentlemen, are you ready for that? (Cries of "no, no!")

We can do that; we can do anything in that line; we can have a great army on land. But do you consider what a change it will require in all our ways of thinking, in all of our political habits and principles, even in the very institutions of the United States? Are we prepared to establish ourselves as a naval power, building up a war-fleet as great as that of Great Britain and France combined? That is what it means to be the leading sea-power of the world.

There is one thing which ought not to be left out of consideration. The great navies to-day are merely experiments, of very uncertain issue. There is not a single war-ship afloat of which any admiral in the world knows how it will behave in actual conflict. Do you know what the principal experience has been with the great battle-ships, so far? It is that when two of those ships belonging to the same navy touch one another, one goes down! (Applause.) The great naval powers of the world are now engaged in one of the most gigantic experiments of

all ages. By the expense of untold millions of money, by the exertion of an immeasurable working power, they have built up machineries of which nobody knows what they will do when they come into actual use. The question for us is, if we desire to build ourselves up, to a certain extent as a naval power, will it not be wisest for us to wait until we see what this experiment comes to. Will it not be wise, at least for the present, to withhold the millions upon millions until we know whether the ships will be good for anything? Our whole experience goes to show that when a battle-ship is launched and is left five years, it is obsolete, and has to be withdrawn as an old hulk. Is it wise for this nation to spend its money and its working forces in experiments which are certainly not in its line? I want to show the flag of the United States in all parts of the globe, too. (Applause.) But I would show that flag as the flag of the commercial navy of the United States. (Applause.) I want it to carry our products, I want it to carry our ideas and our civilization; and then I do not care whether it carries our guns or not. (Applause.)

MR. PARKER, of New York: In our estimation of the pacifying results of international arbitration, which we look forward to in the future, we must not forget that in the experiment of civilization which has brought all questions between individuals into the courts, there has yet been the necessity,—and the necessity seems greater to-day than ever—for the maintenance of the police power of the state. I do not deem it an improbability that when peace and harmony shall reign all over the world, there may yet be found some recalcitrant nation or people, who may perhaps commit crimes against the federation of the world which that federation may be called upon to suppress. For that reason I do not think that the question of disarmament at the present time should be brought forward, or at least seriously considered as one of the elements of discussion in this Conference. It is beyond question that, as in the government of the state penitentiaries are essential, the police are essential, police courts are essential, so in that better time we are looking forward to, when there shall be no more wars between nations, and when there shall be, as far as can be, a strict observance of international law, there will still remain to each nation the necessity of contributing its share toward the guarding of those rights which we hope to have established by international arbitration.

MR. LOVE, of Philadelphia: Two things cannot occupy the same space at the same time. We are intent upon an international court of arbitration. If our minds are filled with this thought, we shall have no time and no desire to talk about an armed navy; we shall think of the one purpose that has brought us from all parts of the country. The disarmament question will take care of itself if we are intent upon our great and holy purpose. Those words of Whittier occur to me:

"O make us through the centuries long
In peace secure, in justice strong!
Around our gift of Freedom draw
The safeguards of Thy righteous law
And, made in some divine mould,
Let the new cycle shame the old!"

(Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT then invited GENERAL HOWARD to speak, saying, "General Howard has been a man of peace all his life, but he knows what war is also."

GENERAL HOWARD: Like my friend from Minneapolis, I am nearer the border than I was formerly; I come from

Vermont, and, with the honorable Chairman, I represent Vermont in this Conference.

I am very reluctant to say anything about this matter. Some friends from New York telegraphed me when I was in Kansas, about the time the President issued his Venezuela message, and asked me to give a reply, in so many words, as to what I thought of it. I answered, "The message is admirable," and then some of the newspapers said, "You cannot trust an army officer, he always goes for war." I had no idea, in that answer, of going for war; it was only its manliness which I liked. We want to take a strong position, a manly position, for we are young as a people.

I am for the settlement of all possible difficulties by arbitration, and I should be delighted, more than I could express, to see such a treaty between ourselves and Great Britain as would secure the settlement of every question by arbitration;—the question of the life of a nation, of course, must be left out. My heart and my mind go with you in all this work. Still, I do not think we lose anything by a manly assertion of what is right. I think our friend meant, when he spoke of the flag going to all parts of the world, that he wants to have our own vessels on the seas and in every part of the world,—not naval vessels necessarily, for we do not want any more navy proportionately than we have army. (Applause.) But we would be very foolish if we went to New York and abolished the police, trusting in the Lord for the protection of New York? New York would go to pieces in a week. You might as well abolish your fire department. You want a national police, but that does not hinder arbitration, and manliness will secure it. Great Britain, too, will have her police force on the sea and on the land, and we will stand side by side, hand in hand, to do right before the world. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received a telegram from ex-Governor Buckner, of Kentucky, regretting his inability to attend this Conference, and expressing his sympathy with its objects.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN announced that Judge Charles E. Fenner of New Orleans had sent the address which he would have made had he been present, and that it would be printed with the Proceedings.

JUDGE DALY, for the Committee on Permanent Organization, recommended the election of a permanent executive committee, to be composed of the following gentlemen, they having power to fill vacancies and to enlarge their number, to carry out the general purposes which the Conference has in view:

Charles C. Harrison, Herbert Welsh, and J. H. Converse, of Pennsylvania; Henry Hitchcock, of Missouri; John Randolph Tucker, of Virginia; Judge D. M. Key, of Tennessee; ex-Governor J. S. Pillsbury, of Minnesota; Horace Davis of California; Alexander T. Humphreys, of Kentucky; William E. Dodge, L. T. Chamberlain, John B. Moore, George L. Rives, and Carl Schurz, of New York; Lyman J. Gage, William C. Gray, and W. A. Fuller, of Illinois; Charles Francis Adams, Charles W. Eliot, and Edward Atkinson, of Massachusetts; Charles E. Fenner, of Louisiana; Simeon E. Baldwin, of Connecticut; Josiah Crosby, of Maine; Fleming Du Bignon, of Georgia; Chancellor A. T. McGill, of New Jersey; Oscar R. Hundley, of Alabama; and W. H. Taft, of Ohio.

The gentlemen named by the committee were unanimously elected, and the Conference adjourned.

FOURTH SESSION.

Thursday Afternoon, April 23.

The Conference was called to order by the President at 3 P. M. The programme for the afternoon had been announced as the Report of the Committee on Resolutions, and speeches, limited to five minutes each, in discussion of that report.

The report of the committee was presented by PRESIDENT JAMES B. ANGELL of Michigan, who said in offering it:

The committee have received a considerable number of communications from various gentlemen and from various bodies throughout the country; they have given careful consideration to them, and desire to present this report as a substitute for them all. They have instructed me to ask that those papers, many of which are of interest, be referred to the Committee on Business, that they may make such disposition of them as they please.

This disposition of the resolutions and communications was ordered by a unanimous vote.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. President: Your Committee on Resolutions, having carefully considered the several propositions referred to them, respectfully report the following as a substitute for the same:

This national conference of American citizens, assembled at Washington, April 22, 1896, to promote international arbitration, profoundly convinced that experience has shown that war, as a method of determining disputes between nations, is oppressive in its operation, uncertain and unequal in its results, and productive of immense evils, and that the spirit and humanity of the age, as well as the precepts of religion, require the adoption of every practicable means for the establishment of reason and justice between nations; and considering that the people of the United States and the people of Great Britain, bound together by ties of a common language and literature, of like political and legal institutions, and of many mutual interests, and animated by a spirit of devotion to law and justice, have on many occasions, by recourse to peaceful and friendly arbitration, manifested their just desire to substitute reason for force in the settlement of their differences, and to establish a reign of peace among nations; that the common sense and enlightened public opinion of both nations is utterly averse to any further war between them; and that the same good sense re-enforced by common principles of humanity, religion and justice, requires the adoption of a permanent method for the peaceful adjustment of international controversies, which method shall not only provide for the uniform application of principles of law and justice in the settlement of their own differences, but shall also, by its example and its results, promote the peace and progress of all peoples, does hereby adopt the following resolutions:

First—That in the judgment of this conference, religion, humanity and justice, as well as the material interests of civilized society, demand the immediate establishment between the United States and Great Britain of a permanent system of arbitration; and the earliest possible extension of the system so as to embrace the whole civilized world.

Second—That it is earnestly recommended to our government, so soon as it is assured of a corresponding disposition on the part of the British government, to nego-

tiate a treaty providing for the widest practicable application of the method of arbitration to international controversies.

Third—That a committee of this conference be appointed to prepare and present to the President of the United States, a memorial respectfully urging the taking of such steps on the part of the United States as will best conduce to the end in view.

The report was received with applause. The President then invited MR. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, of Connecticut, to open the discussion.

MR. WARNER: I am, for one, very glad to get to business. We are very busy people, and yet sometimes we do like to postpone the active doing of a thing. Stephen Girard, you remember, once offered a man a hundred thousand dollars if he would mind his own business, and the man wouldn't do it. I support this resolution most heartily, because I think it means a definite step forward in the career which was laid out for this nation when the foundations were laid. We have passed out of our colonial period; it is high time that we pass out of our provincial period, and take such a view of our position in this world as our size, our intelligence, and our Christian spirit entitle us to take. And I, for one, am exceedingly glad that a representation from all the States and Territories of the United States meets here, in a peaceful manner, unintimidated by any threats and making no threats, simply to execute what I conceive to be the spirit of American civilization.

It is very fit that this nation should be the leader in this respect, because it is a cosmopolitan nation. Some of you saw the great naval review in New York; some of you may have seen the procession, which took some hours in passing down Broadway, of the crews of all the various nations represented in that review,—the Russian, the Italian, the German, the Spanish, the Mexican, the Brazilian, and so on. Every nationality that had then a navy afloat, every color, every race, was represented in that procession. And the significant thing was that, as it went down Broadway, every squad of men was cheered and saluted by a vast number of their own compatriots occupying the sidewalk. That, I think, would not have taken place in any other country in the world. That showed the composite character of the American people; and that is one of the reasons why, selected out of all times and re-enforced by all the civilizations, we may be expected to assume the leadership in this matter. I know it is said, — and I am not under any illusions about this matter, I think, — that we cannot afford to throw down any barriers. It is quite true that we cannot yet go to bed without locking our doors, notwithstanding we have the constituted civil authorities to protect us. And I suppose it is equally true that we cannot afford to leave our coast unprotected for any little privateering marauder that should have a notion to poke his nose in there and make trouble. And I believe, that in the interest of commerce and civilization as well, it is still as necessary to police the sea as it is to police the land. But when I am told that England is an aggressive, a pushing, a grasping nation; that she is never satisfied with the land she has, but wants the territory adjoining; that she says openly that commerce follows the flag, and that war must be necessary at times for commerce; I have simply this to say, that this great country has now come to a state of power and consideration in the world where it can afford to say to Great Britain, "If you will forfeit

your place as leader in civilization, we will not. And we stand here, as we have always stood, for peace." (Applause.)

Mr. Warner's time having expired, the President said :

I now have the pleasure of introducing to you the Hon. J. L. M. CURRY of this city, who for many years was engaged in the diplomatic service of this country, and for many years last past has been engaged in one of the most noble social charities for the advancement of our countrymen that has been known among men.

MR. CURRY : My varied experience has not taught me how to compress into five minutes what would take a full hour. And therefore I shall content myself with expressing my most cordial approbation of the preamble and resolutions which have been read, and of the objects of this Conference, and my congratulations upon the fact that we begin to-day a new era in the history of civilization. (Applause.) And as it is utterly impossible to give in two or three minutes the reasons for the faith that is in me, I will please my successors and you by giving the rest of my time to them.

The next speaker introduced was OSCAR R. HUNDLEY, Esq., of Alabama.

MR. HUNDLEY : *Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Conference*—I confess to some little degree of embarrassment at being selected as one of the chief speakers on this occasion, without notice and preparation. But, sir, the preparation for an occasion like this is not in the head, it is in the heart. Inspiration comes from the occasion itself, from the earnest look in the faces before me, and from the God-given principles of the eternal brotherhood of all mankind and the rock-ribbed laws of eternal justice. It is a matter of supreme gratification to me to be here and to endorse the sentiments expressed in the resolutions. Coming, as I do, from that portion of our country which has felt the ravages of war, I am glad and proud to bear testimony to-day that we have converted our swords into plowshares and our knives into pruning-hooks. (Applause.) I am glad to be here to do homage at the feet of the Goddess of Peace, whose handmaid is Truth, whose architect is Justice, and whose guardian angel is Mercy. (Applause.)

This is an auspicious occasion. We are here to extend to our brethren across the waters what we believe to be the principles of truth, justice and right. We desire to say to them that we intend to nurture, foster, uphold and maintain those God-given principles which spring from the hearts of a free and enlightened people. In the limited time which is given me to speak, however, it is utterly impossible to do full justice to the matter under consideration. And as I see before me men who may desire to speak on the resolutions, — men upon whom rests the weight of years, experience and honors, — it is meet and proper that a young man like myself should be modest. Therefore, without anything further to say upon the subject, I beg to say that I most heartily and earnestly endorse the resolutions, and trust they may be adopted without a dissenting vote. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT : I have now the pleasure to introduce to you MR. HITCHCOCK of St. Louis, who has stood first among the illustrious of the bar of the United States, both in his own State and in the grand tribunal that sits in the Capitol, — always an advocate of the very principles of right and justice in the government of this country that we now wish to establish between the two great nations of the world.

MR. HITCHCOCK : *Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen*—I was not aware until late this morning that the committee had done me the honor to draft me to any part in this debate. I am therefore obliged to ask your indulgence. The conclusions stated here receive my warmest support. I am unable to express adequately the profound sense which I have of their importance to humanity at large. When we consider all the evils which are sought to be averted, and all the blessings which must follow from their adoption in practice by the nations of the world, imagination fails to conceive the blessings which must follow from such a course.

Perhaps I may be permitted, as having taken part in the deliberations of the committee, to suggest to any who have thought that it would have been well to go somewhat more into detail, who have expected that this conference would adopt, formulate and recommend a specific plan, that there are reasons why it would not be wise to do so. The committee thought it wise to content themselves with the statement of the general principles because of which arbitration is recommended, and to leave, — as they must necessarily leave, — to the authorities of the nations who shall take it up, the devising of those details and the forming and adoption of that plan which will make it a practical thing. A moment's reflection will show that it is one thing to propose to ourselves a certain end, which may be stated in a few words, but quite another thing to select and adopt, among all possible methods, the best method to carry out that end. That function necessarily belongs, in a matter of this kind, to those who are charged with official power and official duty. Nothing which this Conference could adopt would be binding upon them. There might be diversities of opinion among the members of this Conference ; and if those diversities should lead to a diverse expression, not as to the end to be attained, but as to the means of attaining it, might there not be danger that the great end that we all seek might be obscured, and its achievement impeded by differences which, after all, are only differences of detail, and which we are not competent nor authorized to determine? (Applause.)

What is the function of this Conference? It represents that which we all know to be the power back of all government in this country, the power of public opinion. (Applause.) That is its great function. No government in this country can stand or ought to stand unless it be supported by public opinion. And by public opinion I do not mean the temporary gust of passion, of prejudice, of conviction based upon insufficient consideration. Of course there must be such gusts ; there must be erroneous ideas on this subject or that, political and moral, which may prevail for a time ; but we come back to that statement which Lincoln made immortal : " You may fool some of the people all the time, and you may fool all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all the time." (Applause.) We do not undertake to represent all the people of the United States, but we do undertake to express calmly, deliberately, honestly, and with profound conviction those great truths which are fundamental. If we believe in popular government, if we believe in reason and justice, if we believe the Christian precepts which are on our lips every day, — those great principles which must lie back of and be the foundation of all governments which are fit to endure, and which, above all, must underlie, if it is to endure, a government which claims to be a government

of the people and by the people and for the people (applause),—if we believe these, we must openly declare them.

The question was then opened for general debate.

MR. SKINNER, of New York: The resolutions as presented by the committee are admirable in every respect. I would not move to make a change. And yet, in view of the many educational interests which are represented in this Conference, I should have been glad if the first paragraph had included an additional word, so that it should read, "In the judgment of this Conference, religion, education, humanity, and justice, as well as the material interests of civilization, etc." Believing, as I do, that our schools must make our citizens, I desire to call the attention of the Conference to the importance of the educational feature of the work so well done here. We have instituted a movement which is of interest to every loyal citizen throughout our country. We are doing something more; we are building for the future; we are building a monument to which our children are to look for inspiration and for guidance. Again, I believe that these resolutions, and the action of this Conference, should be an educating force, to educate the writers of history in this country to recognize the importance, not of the great wars and the great battles alone, but of what has been done in the hundred cases that have been settled through the peaceful methods of arbitration. (Applause.) Our histories, if we search them through, will be found lacking in that indispensable thing, of telling our children what has been done through peace and not through the slaughter of our fellow-men. (Applause.)

MR. POWELL, of New York: I think the Conference should adopt the report as it stands. I approve heartily of what Mr. Skinner has said, but I believe the essence of it to be found in the report as it comes from the committee.

MR. LOVE of Pennsylvania: We can all heartily endorse and accept what has been offered us. But if we can improve it by a single word, let us do so. I move, as an amendment, that where we speak of reason as against force we insert the word "carnal" or "deadly force." Reason is a force, a tremendous force; the principle of peace is a tremendous force.

MR. ANDERSON, of Pennsylvania: I desire to express my hearty approval of the resolutions as reported by the committee. They put tersely the very ideas that we came here to advocate. I know how easy criticism is, and I feel that the work of the committee is a masterpiece itself. (Applause.) I desire to ask the gentlemen here who take such interest in this work that they pass those resolutions without the alteration of a word or a line. (Applause.)

MR. RIDDLE, of Texas: I approve of the resolutions. I voice the sentiment of the people of my State when I say this. There is, however, in the phraseology of the preamble, a line to which I object, and that is this: "of like political and legal institutions," referring to the institutions of America and Great Britain. This may be true, but such has not been my teaching. I know that in many respects the political and legal institutions of the United States and England are similar, and that in many respects the institutions of the United States have their foundations in the principles given to us by the mother-country. But it is not my understanding that the Declaration of Independence was written in the furtherance of principles which are the same as those advocated by the

English people. I desire to offer, as an amendment to the preamble, to strike out the words I have indicated.

THE CHAIR ruled that amendments to the preamble were not in order until the resolutions had been disposed of. He then asked the indulgence of the Conference to ask the Rev. Dr. Hoge of Richmond, Virginia, to speak.

DR. HOGE: The first gentleman who spoke made the remark that one obstacle in the way of our success is that we are a very busy people. While that is true, I think another obstacle is that so many good men have never informed themselves upon this subject, and therefore feel no particular interest or enthusiasm about it. We have a great work to do, to educate our own people, and to get up public sentiment, all through this land, that shall vibrate through every part of it. (Applause.) The gentleman from Alabama said that we need not argue this question, because our inspiration came out of our hearts. But I beg leave to say, in the presence of this great Christian assembly, that the inspiration and influence that we most need comes from heaven. (Applause.)

It is a very interesting thought that this city was selected to be the place of the meeting,—the city from which influences go out through all this land, through all the world; the city in which the venerable jurist lived who wrote the most complete treatise on international law that is extant; a city that is full of patriotic men, that are ready to give their time and their toil and their money for the furtherance of every enterprise that has for its end the uplifting of the people, the ennobling of the race. Ideas, even the noblest, move very slowly, and colonize very slowly; and yet they colonize, and under the providence of God the world is moving in the right direction, and moving continually to a higher plane. When men like these gather together, with one idea, with one great purpose, united in their sentiment and fired with such a hearty enthusiasm, we cannot doubt that an influence is to be generated by this meeting that is to be felt through all the history of our land in the coming time. We all might adopt what I think the grandest sentence in the prose writings of John Milton. Did I not believe that this is an audience composed, to a very large extent, of Christian men, I would not quote it:

"Come forth out of thy royal chamber, O Prince of Peace! O Prince of all the kings of the earth, put on the visible robes of thy majesty, take up the unlimited sceptre which thy Father hath bequeathed to thee! For now the Church, thy bride, is calling thee and all the turbulent, warring nations of the world sigh for peace and sigh to be redeemed." (Applause.)

DR. GRAY, of Chicago: I rise to call your attention to a view of this matter which has not been mentioned in this convention. My profession leads me into acquaintance with the periodical literature of all parts of the world. I know through my exchanges what they are thinking about in Australia, in Van Diemen's Land,—wherever the English language is spoken. I have found that whenever this question was raised, the echo would come back from every part of the world, from all the one hundred and twenty millions of us who speak the English language.

MR. FOLLETT, of Ohio: Cannot we enlarge this resolution to embrace other nations beside England? I have not understood why we have limited this effort, and asked the executive of the United States to take but one step forward, for arbitration with one nation? I know that our hearts are larger, our desire is greater, and why cannot we add to this resolution at least the words "other nations"? It would be a disappointment to many of us,

and to the world, if we should only accomplish this one object, noble as that object would be, and grand as it would be as a beginning. Why can we not embrace other nations, great, powerful, friendly to the United States? (Applause.)

JUDGE DALY: This subject is one which has been considered by many of the gentlemen attending this Conference, and the result of their joint reasoning, so far as I have heard it, is that the proper way is to have a beginning and the true beginning between the two great nations who speak the same language. (Applause.) All the rest will follow. My opinion is that we shall spoil things by attempting too much at first. We are making a large beginning when we come to establish a system of arbitration between two of the greatest civilized nations on earth. There is much difference between small nations and large nations; it is difficult to federate them together into one system. If we can do one practical thing all the rest will follow. (Applause.)

MR. PARKER, of New York: I would hesitate long before I would mar in any slightest degree the almost perfect symmetry and comprehensiveness of the report of the Committee. But it does occur to me that some allusion in the resolutions themselves might be made which would show to other nations than England and ourselves that there is a desire on the part of this Conference, at some time or other, to include them in that beneficial result which we hope will follow from this Conference. Might the resolution be amended in a slight particular, so as to advise that the effort of the government should be ultimately extended to other nations who sought or desired to avail themselves of such a court of arbitration, and that the President and Congress of the United States might also include them in the operation of any convention or treaty or court of arbitration that may be established? There might be a feeling of jealousy on the part of other nations at being excluded from the operation of treaties or conventions which are to affect all nations. If the result of our efforts should be that there should be established a court of arbitration between England and America alone, it might be thought that there was a dual alliance between two countries of enormous power, which might have some ulterior object.

DR. SMITH, of Baltimore: One of the most hopeful things about this matter, in my mind, is the fact that it is confined to two nations. (Applause.) The more the nations, the greater will be the difficulty. We all know the hardest thing in the world is to make peace. Here are the two great English-speaking peoples of the world; if they can only be induced,—and there will be difficulties enough in the way,—to appoint a court of arbitration, it will carry the world. Other nations will come. But it seems to me that we shall do much to defeat the whole object if we reach out to bring in more and more discordant elements, and multiply difficulties. I hope that the resolution, just as it came from the committee, will pass. (Applause.)

JUDGE EDMUNDS, calling Dr. Curry to the chair, addressed the Conference as follows:

JUDGE EDMUNDS: I ask the indulgence of the Conference to say in two minutes how this thing appears to me, as one of the members living near that Canadian border which is supposed to be dangerous. I agree very largely with Mr. Parker in what he has said. If what we desire between ourselves and Great Britain shall be effectuated by the resolutions, as I have great hopes that within a

year or two it will be, unless some expression looking further is put into these resolutions it will be felt by the other nations of the world, and necessarily, that this means that there is to be no war between Great Britain and the United States, and that whenever either of them gets into trouble with any nation, the other is to be its ally. I should hope that the committee would feel willing and that the gentlemen of the Conference would feel willing, to add this to the first resolution, which I think will then cover the whole *morale* of the question and relieve it from what, to my mind, is a very serious difficulty. I move to insert in the first resolution, after the words "Great Britain," these words: "And as far as possible with other civilized nations." (Applause.)

DR. TRUEBLOOD, of Boston: I feel some delicacy in expressing any disagreement with the distinguished gentleman who has proposed this amendment. I sympathize most fully with the expression of Mr. Parker and other gentlemen, that the United States should open the way, in the best possible spirit, for the entrance of other nations besides Great Britain, into an agreement like this which we propose. But after many years' careful study of the question, I cannot but feel that at the present moment we shall weaken the force of our effort if we make any allusion in the declaration of this Conference,—which has been advertised throughout the country, throughout Great Britain, throughout the world as having a specific aim,—to other nations than England. It is well known that our country has, on at least two occasions, opened the door for this sort of arbitration treaties with all the nations of the world. In this city on the 4th of April, 1890, there was passed by the Senate (and previously by the House) what is known as the Sherman Concurrent Resolution, which was sent, through our State Department, to all the diplomats of the United States throughout the civilized world, for this express purpose. In that same year, in October, under the secretaryship of Mr. Blaine, there was sent to all the civilized nations, through our diplomats, the Pan-American form of treaty, and they were invited,—and this invitation stands upon the records of the State Department to this day,—to join us in the proposed Pan-American treaty of arbitration. It is well understood, therefore, throughout the world that we hold the door wide open for this sort of convention with all the nations. I venture, therefore, to suggest that we should limit the force of our effort on this occasion to Great Britain and the United States. Napoleon, in his battles, always turned his heavy guns upon one strong point in the enemy's lines, believing that if he could break their strength there, the battle would be won. I think that a treaty and a court of this kind, established with Great Britain, will do more for the promotion of the very thing which these gentlemen aim at, in regard to other nations, if we at the present time do not refer to them, than if we do. I hope that the amendment will not pass. (Applause.)

JUDGE EDMUNDS: I agree with the illustration of my friend in regard to Napoleon. He always turned his heavy guns upon one point in the enemy's lines; but at the same time he always held out what I am sorry to say were illusory promises and invitations for peace to everybody else. We have laid down, in what we propose to pass, a general principle that ought to govern human conduct; and we follow that by a second limited statement, that the thing is to be accomplished by a treaty that binds ourselves and our English friends into a state of absolute

and perpetual peace, leaving each, without any fear of the other, to fight the rest of mankind. The second statement ought to be as general as the first.

MR. HORT, of Washington: The case, it strikes me, is quite different from what it was in the case of the Pan-American proposal. The proposition to-day is that we shall, if possible, proceed directly to the establishment of a high court of arbitration, as between these two great powers. But I cannot see why there should not be at the same time a cordial invitation to any other nation, great or small, to strike hands with us in our efforts for universal peace. (Applause.) I therefore feel constrained, notwithstanding the remarks of the gentlemen who have spoken for the report of the committee without amendment, to second the motion that this invitation be accorded to the other nations as well, so that no jealousies may arise.

DR. MOXOM, of Massachusetts: Like others who have spoken, I am profoundly in sympathy with the amendment offered by Judge Edmunds. But it strikes me that we shall further our purposes more directly if the expression of our desire in the direction of treaties of arbitration with other nations shall be put into the preamble (applause), and shall, therefore, be a part of the general expression of principle. The resolutions which we are expecting to adopt contemplate a specific action. My conviction is that if the United States and England shall speedily come into such an understanding as shall result in the adoption of a treaty or a system of arbitration between them, the effect upon other nations will be not such as it would be if an alliance offensive and defensive were established between the two nations, which would consolidate Europe against England and the United States; but would have the effect of stimulating the desire on the part of European nations to have a good understanding with each other. I hope that while we shall express, in the general statement of principles in the preamble, our hearty desire to enter into amicable relations, such as shall issue in the establishment of treaties of arbitration with all other nations, we shall, in the resolutions, confine ourselves specifically to the thing for which we came here, and which we hope to see accomplished in the very near future. (Applause.)

DR. DREHER, of Virginia: I want to move that we add to the resolution as it stands the following, which expresses the idea of the last speaker: "And that this Conference expresses the hope that such a system may, in the near future, be so extended as to embrace other civilized nations."

MR. LEIGHTON, of Missouri: I rise with a great deal of hesitancy after so many gentlemen have spoken, to express the idea that in my judgment the preamble and resolutions should be adopted as submitted by the committee. (Applause.) I feel that we are treading upon very dangerous ground when we undertake to improve them. There probably is not a gentleman in this Conference who, taking those resolutions in his hand, could not change a word here or there, which in his judgment might perfect the resolutions. But I think I can read between the lines of the report as submitted, that almost every consideration that has been mentioned in this discussion has been before the committee and been considered by them. To my mind this whole question of international arbitration is a stage in the evolution of civilization itself,—a stage which has only now been reached for the first time, and that by only two of the civilized

nations of the earth. Heretofore, as we all know, behind the quarrels of nations have been causes other than those which have appeared upon the surface. Allusion has been made once or twice in the discussions to the inadequate causes of war; I do not suppose that any intelligent gentleman believes that the refusal of the German emperor to disavow the candidacy of a prince of the Hohenzollerns to the Spanish throne was the cause of the Franco-Prussian war. Heretofore the excuse for war has not been the cause of war. In my judgment, the greatest attainment in establishing the principle of arbitration will be in compelling nations to put upon record the true causes of difficulty between them and the real point to be decided. I do not believe that any country in Europe, outside Great Britain, has reached the point where its statesmen can be compelled by public opinion to state the true issue of any dispute between it and another nation. Continental nations to-day are too much under the impulse of their statesmen and their rulers, and too little under the government of public opinion. I believe this is a question of practical politics. We had better hold this movement where the committee have placed it, directly and incisively towards an agreement with Great Britain as the only practicable thing to be attended to to-day. (Applause.)

JUDGE EDMUNDS withdrew his amendment, in favor of that proposed by Dr. Dreher as covering the same ground.

MR. ——— of North Carolina: It seems to me that there is some misunderstanding in the Conference as to the effect of the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment, as I understand it, in no wise enlarges the scope of the proposed action which we recommend to the executive of this government, but simply, correctly states the ethical principle, that we wish to be at peace with all the world and that we would like to have our differences settled by arbitration. And then follows the resolution, that in order to carry that into effect as far as practicable at the present time, we attempt to establish, with Great Britain only, a permanent system of arbitration. I think if this is understood all objection to the amendment will fade away.

MR. CRAFTS, of Washington, asked for a re-reading of the preamble, that it might be seen if all that was desired was not contained in it. It was read by Dr. Chamberlain.

DR. DREHER asked leave to change the phraseology of his amendment, so that it might read, "And that such a system be, as early as possible, so extended as to embrace other civilized nations."

JUDGE HAMMOND, of Georgia: The only difficulty is that the Conference should understand what the committee desire. The preamble states that we desire peace throughout the whole earth, and that the way we propose to get it is to get the two great English-speaking nations to start the ball a-rolling. (Applause.) Shakespeare in stopping a great war by wedding one royal family to the other said:

"When two such silver currents join
They glorify the banks that bind them in."

It is said here that other nations will be jealous that we and England have joined hands in the pledge of peace. Jealous of what? Jealous that we have declared against war? The sense of the call that brought us here, the sense of the talk which we have had here, most sensible and eloquent, was that the way to do this thing was to put these two nations on record in favor of the move-

ment, and let the remainder of the world watch it and see its consequences, that we may educate them into the same thought. I beg that you will not place any obstacle in the way of letting this movement be started in the manner pointed out in the call, in the manner so forcibly enforced last night, and in the manner unanimously adopted by the committee to whom you entrusted the honor of preparing these resolutions. (Applause.)

MR. SCHURZ: I must confess that it is difficult for me to understand the trouble to which the amendment to these resolutions has given rise. I take it that we are agreed in the great ideal we aim at, which is to establish such a system of international arbitration as will embrace, not only the United States and Great Britain, but if possible all nations on the earth. (Applause.) I am sure there is not a member of this conference who would not be heartily glad to see this result accomplished. I expressed the opinion last night that this end would probably be best reached if we began with one of the greatest powers of Europe, that has certain sentimental ties binding it with this country, — in other words, if the movement were begun by the English-speaking nations of the earth. I am of that opinion still. I think also that if these two nations succeed in agreeing upon such a system of arbitration, the result will be that other nations, looking at this great example, will in the course of time come to see that a similar arrangement for them would be of great benefit. We all hope this. Now if we are all of one mind in all these respects, what objection in the world is there to our saying so? (Applause.) What difficulty do you think will arise, if by accepting this amendment we declare that we would be glad if other nations join this arrangement too? Do you think it will frighten away Great Britain from the arrangement? Do you think it will make it less popular in the United States? Do you think that if the United States begin to enter upon negotiations with a view to this object, they will be disturbed by other nations tumbling over one another and giving them so much to do that they cannot attend to Great Britain? What in the name of common sense will be the difficulty created by the adoption of the amendment? I cannot see any. Can you? (VOICES—"no, no!")

Now will it be more than a mere expression of a sentiment which we all entertain? Again, suppose you do not adopt this amendment. Suppose, then, some other power comes and says, "We too are in favor of international arbitration, and we want to enter into an arrangement with the United States," will you say, "No, we cannot attend to you because it will interfere with our attending to Great Britain"? Is it possible that you would put yourself in a predicament like this? What then is the difficulty standing in the way of this amendment? It expresses our true sentiments, it extends the hand of friendship and good will to other nations. It says to other nations, "We shall be glad if you will join us in a union of sentiment and a union of interest." I therefore am most heartily in favor of the amendment introduced by Judge Edmunds, and afterwards modified by Dr. Dreher.

The amendment, as modified, was read again by the secretary.

The question being called for, a vote was taken on the adoption of the amendment, which was ordered.

The three resolutions were then voted upon and adopted separately.

MR. LOVE: I rise to speak of a point of history, that I think it will be well to weave into our deliberations, as a courtesy to our government and as a courtesy to Great Britain. Ought we not in some way to recognize the fact that this government, in 1874, issued an invitation, not only to Great Britain but to all nations, for just exactly the thing we are asking for now? And did not Great Britain return that compliment, when quite a number of members of Parliament came to our country bearing a memorial signed by 234 members of that body? And following it up, did not Mr. Cremer come to our country again with three hundred and fifty-four signatures of members of Parliament, and appearing before the President of the United States, beg that we would consummate what we had commenced? It seems to me that in our resolutions we ought to recognize these great historical facts which are in the line of the progress of the age. I hope the convention will make some allusion in this last resolution to this part of the history of our American government, and the efforts that have been made by our Administration from time to time.

THE CHAIR suggested that the committee in preparing the memorial will probably be able to cover the whole ground.

Upon motion, it was voted that a committee of five members, to be appointed by the Chair, should draw up a memorial to the President and Congress of the United States, to be presented with the resolutions just passed.

On motion of DR. CURRY, it was voted unanimously that Judge Edmunds be the chairman of the Committee on Memorial.

The committee was then appointed as follows: The President of the Conference, President Angell, Mr. Gardiner Hubbard, Dr. Curry and Mr. Hitchcock.

MR. RIDDLE, of Texas, offered again his amendment to the preamble, which was to strike out the words "of like political and legal institutions."

MR. MEAD, of Massachusetts: I sincerely hope that this expression will not be struck out. The words seem to me most accurate. I think we are all agreed that, though our institutions are not identical, they are more similar than the institutions of any other two nations upon earth. I should not object to such an expression with regard to France, where the central government is far stronger than in England, or of the so-called republics of Venezuela or Brazil. But it seems to me important that we should emphasize the fact that our institutions are more similar than those of any other two nations.

The question being on the amendment to the preamble, the vote was in the negative. The preamble was then adopted unanimously. The Conference then adjourned.

At the close of this session an informal reception was given to the delegates by Hon. John W. Foster at his home.

LAST SESSION.

The Conference met for its closing session in the Grand Opera House, Pennsylvania Avenue, Thursday evening, April 23d. On calling the members to order, the PRESIDENT said:

It gives me great pleasure to say that the Conference at its business meeting has, harmoniously and satisfactorily, prepared a statement of the great and beneficent objects that it has in view, with the hope that all the people of the United States, of every creed, by descent of

every race, and of every kind of political opinion, have come so near the millenium that they are all in friendly brotherhood acting together for peace among mankind. In the furtherance of this object this evening's meeting is to be held, and I have great pleasure in presenting to you, as the first speaker, my old friend,—not old in years but in experience,—MR. J. RANDOLPH TUCKER of Virginia, whom you all know by reputation.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. RANDOLPH TUCKER.

Mr. President: Twenty-five centuries ago, the Hebrew prophet declared, in sublimely poetic words, that in the latter ages Jehovah would judge between many peoples, and rebuke strong nations afar off. . . "And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." We have here the prophecy of international arbitration, to supersede and prevent war, to substitute reason for brute force as the *ultima ratio*. In all subsequent eras men have dreamed of this auspicious result; and we come here to-night to promote the final triumph of the divine prediction of the Hebrew seer as to the destiny of our race.

A few,—the number growing small by degrees and beautifully less,—still, against the dark background of war, present examples of heroism, chivalry, martial glory and Christian virtue among those whose deeds have been most illustrious in military annals, and point with pride to the providential uses of war in defending liberty, in crushing tyranny, and in extending the bounds of civilization. Such still maintain that Mars must be perpetuated as a teacher of heroic virtues, as the avenger of wrongdoing, and as the champion of human right. We need not contest the claim that despite enormous evils, war has furnished great occasions for the display of the highest virtues, and has been used as an important means in the greatest achievements of mankind. But the claim really involves the concession that war is only justified when needed to suppress human wrongdoing, and when selfish passions will admit no other arbitrament. For where is the man who will hold that brute force can better decide a moral question than Christian reason? Is not this appeal to physical power to determine such an issue contrary to the plain dictates of common sense, and to the teachings of divine providence? What relation to right or wrong has the fistic brutality of the ring, the sad issues of the duello, or the most glorious battle-field, any more than the bull-fights of the arena? The trial by battle has long been excluded from civilized courts; why not exorcise it from international relations?

The cynic will say: "Your scheme is very beautiful, but it is impracticable. It is akin to the Republic of Plato, and the Utopia of More." Human progress has had to meet the laugh of skepticism at its every step. Without faith all things are impossible; by faith mountains have been scaled, oceans have been traversed, new worlds have been discovered, and the magic wire has become the medium of thought from continent to continent, until humanity, diverse in race, origin, and position has been made one in purpose and in destiny. Nothing is impossible with God, and nothing which is at one with the divine economy is impossible to man, when undertaken with trust in divine power, for the accomplishment of divine purpose. (Applause.)

Conceding the difficulties which confront the members

of this Conference, they should not paralyze our efforts, nor weaken our faith. What are the difficulties? All may be summed up in this one: How can the commonwealth of nations, like a commonwealth of men, be instituted under a common law, to be administered by recognized courts of judges, and to be enforced by the unified authority of all? We need an international law, international tribunals to adjudicate conflicts under this law, and a supreme authority to enforce judgments against recalcitrant states. We need a law to prescribe rules of conduct, courts to decide cases, and an international *posse comitatus* to enforce judicial decisions. Are we sufficient for these things? If not, what can be practically done, in so directing international relations as to achieve the conservation of the rights of each and all, in peace and without resort to war?

First, let it be noted that the range of individual freedom is much enlarged,—nay, personal freedom is made possible,—by the existence in civilization of moral forces which are internal in their action and have no expression in municipal law. Thousands of our citizens feel no constraint from precept or force of municipal law, because they need it not, being controlled by the moral force of conscience in the conduct of their life. They are a law to themselves, and government may, as to such, abdicate its forceful power, because their liberty is in accord with a law higher and deeper than the laws of the land. And history teaches us this lesson, that as the individual man rises to the plane of complete self-control, his liberty may be indefinitely extended in consistence with the safety of others and the order of society. And it is only as moral forces decrease and as man declines to barbarism that governmental power must be enlarged at the expense of personal liberty, lest the social order be disturbed, and the rights of others be made insecure by a license which is only liberty without self-control.

This capacity to govern self lessens the need of civil power to secure social order, and liberty may safely be increased. On the contrary, the lack of the self-controlling power requires the decrease of liberty and the increase of civil power to secure social order. The state is sound which ensures to man the maximum of freedom, and gives to government the minimum of power consistent with social order and peace.

Now when we look at a nation as an aggregation of men, each of whom is subject to those moral forces, and see that this aggregation cannot be free from its rightful control, and therefore that the nation, as well as the man, must have a conscience to which as the divine vicegerent, both are responsible, it follows that as nations rise in the scale of moral self-control, they, like men in the same condition, will reach a realm of self-restraint in which they will be ready to recognize and practice the dictates of duty prescribed by the moral forces within. This will lessen the need of external law or extraneous forces to uphold right or repress wrong. And as each nation rises to this sphere of self-government, an international public opinion will crystallize which, without any formal legislation, will be potent in constructing a common law based on moral principles, for defining the rules of international conduct to which each must submit as the essential condition of respectability in the family of nations, and that self-respect, a synonym for national honor, without which safety and prosperity will be impossible.

If I am told that this is visionary, tell me then what means the boundary line between Christendom and other

nations, which all Christian nations recognize, except because the gospel of Christ has placed a moral power in the hearts of men composing these nations we call Christendom, which makes any external law so much less necessary in the relations of Christian States than in the nations upon whom the light of Christianity has never shone? Causes are at work by which this great moral conservator is reaching out for the conquest of the world, and to enlarge the area of Christendom by bringing all nations within its influence. Sooner or later Christendom will embrace all nations within its federation, and the moral forces of Christianity will one day thrill every nerve, pulsate every artery, stiffen every sinew, and inspire every human aspiration over all nations of the earth.

This would naturally lead us to limit our present efforts to the nations of Christendom. Indeed, the wisdom of circumscribing our present work to the two English-speaking nations is to me very manifest. Our success in this small realm will, by its example, bring Christendom within the dominating influence of the same principle.

What, then, may be hoped for in the relations between Great Britain and the United States? Both nations agree substantially that there is a *jus inter gentes*, in the form of an international code. This is a point still denied by some, but the denial rests upon a confusion of ideas. Because there is for nations no common law, no common judge, no common executive, some have said that there is no law of nations. There is indeed no *lex*, but there is indeed a *jus*. *Jus* is the objective right, as God sees it; *lex* is subjective right, as man sees it. *Jus* is the law of God, of which *lex* is the human expression. *Jus* is *jus*, right is right, though no legislation recognize it and nations defy it; it is binding upon all nations, though not made *lex* by them. "The *jus inter gentes* is, the law of God independent of positive compact or convention," says Lord Stowell. "Reason and justice," says Chief-Justice Marshall, "which constitute the primary law of nations, are made fixed and stable by judicial decisions." "There is also a conventional law of nations," says the same great judge. Thus Stowell and Marshall, stars of the first magnitude in the firmament of Anglo-American jurisprudence, give full jural force to the *jus inter gentes*, as founded primarily on the law of God, and by consequence on equity and right reason, and fixed and made stable by the convention and judicial expositions of courts, which administer universally, not locally, as international, not local, courts. This *jus inter gentes* is not only a part of the law of the land, but is made so by the Constitution of the United States, and was so recognized in a late law of Congress, prescribing for our government an international duty, which the Supreme Court upheld as constitutional and in accord with the law of nations, in the United States vs. R. Jonah. With this clear recognition of the abstract *jus inter gentes*, what hinders a treaty between the nations of Christendom by which the vague and indefinite principles of international law shall be fixed and made certain in an international code, by which the *jus inter gentes* shall find expression in a *lex inter gentes*? Why not confirm the consensus of public opinion of Christendom and civilization, why not submit questions of international right arisen under such code to the adjudication of tribunals of arbitration by which the brutal decisions of wars shall be forever superseded by the judgment of an international authority?

Without entering on the mooted code question, it may

be said that between nations the consensus of opinion on very many controverted points might be collated and formulated, and a code would be desirable. On this point the way has been opened by the action of the British Association for Social Science, at its meeting at Manchester in 1866. Our late eminent citizen David Dudley Field, whose genius conceived the proposition, by his loyalty and ability worked out the suggestion into an international code, first published in 1872 and a second edition in 1876. In this draft existing international rules were codified, but modifications are suggested under the advanced views of modern civilization. It is a valuable beginning in such work; it proves that a code is practicable, and between Great Britain and the United States should readily be framed and agreed upon. Thousands of questions have been practically settled by convention and by custom for a long period. What could be easier than to codify these, about which there is substantial agreement, and leave open what may be still controverted? Centuries of conflicts over the rights of neutrals and belligerents have passed away, and on the calm bosom of public opinion to-day the wrecks of such conflicts float without collision. In the consensus of nations the errors of exploded doctrines have been replaced by well-regulated rules consistent with the just rights of all nations.

One thing is certain: there is a body of rules which have emerged from centuries of debate, which are no longer debatable. Let these be gathered as the nucleus of the international common law. Let both nations recognize the *jus inter gentes* and the obligatory bond between them, to which, as a recognized *lex*, all conflicts are to be referred. All other conflicts, on new points, can be adjusted by analogy to the positions of the recognized *lex*, in the expansion of our common law and collated jurisprudence. Every lawyer knows how this has been done by the courts, how in fact the law-makers have followed the judges, whose case-made law has been accepted by the legislator and codified.

It is true that questions which pass beyond the domain of proprietary or other strict rights may not be proper subjects for a definite agreement. But even so, certain general principles might be formulated, under which a wise arbitrator could decide the duties of conflicting nations. As an illustration of this class, the Monroe Doctrine and its many phases of application, may be cited, to which doctrine the two countries under our consideration gave their sanction at its birth.

But judicial functions are more readily applied to international disputes than legislation upon principles. The United States has done much to open a pathway for international arbitration, and this has grown largely from the federal relation between the States of the Union. Their absolute independence as colonies, continued under the loose league of the Continental era, and was made permanent in the second article of the Constitution of 1781, by the terms of which each State retained its sovereignty, freedom and independence. Compacts as to their interrelation were embodied in the Articles of Federation, and in 1792 the United States in Congress assembled were made the last resort on appeal in all disputes and differences then or thereafter arising between two States concerning boundary, jurisdiction, or any other case whatsoever. The mode of electing arbitrators was prescribed, and the judgment was made final and conclusive. The method is very instructive in the matter of the international arbitration we are now considering.

In the Constitution of the United States provision was made by which controversies between two States shall be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. Under this provision questions of boundary and the like have been frequently decided conclusively by the Supreme Court, and peaceful submission to these judgments has always ensued. How suggestive are these peaceful solutions of inter-state controversies in our federal union! If forty-five states can thus agree to be bound, why not all nations? (Applause.) Why not Great Britain and the United States, peoples of the same blood, of like institutions and religion? If our Constitution makes this a law for these States, and creates a tribunal for disputes between them, what hinders our hope that one day we shall have the same law to bind all nations, and a tribunal to judge between them,

"In the Parliament of man, the federation of the world"?

(Applause.)

Federation is the harbinger of universal peace, and fraternity of every race. It means the brotherhood of man in a commonwealth of nations.

In the conduct of our foreign relations, this spirit has been manifested in many cases, in Jay's Treaty, and in many others, notably in the Treaty of Washington in 1871 as to the Alabama claims. Provisions for arbitration have been agreed upon with foreign nations, and the awards of the tribunals have peacefully adjusted disputes as to boundary and other matters, to which the separate nations have uniformly submitted in peace. In this last case, the Alabama claims treaty, the previous disagreement as to the *jus inter gentes* on the controverted points was settled by making the American view the *lex* between the contestants restrictively and prospectively, and thus this treaty legislated first and then constructed a tribunal for arbitration. It is a striking precedent for the proposed action. A like remedy, with like result, has been applied to the late Behring Sea controversy.

The mode of selecting arbitrators is not difficult. A treaty between Great Britain and the United States ought of course to provide for such selection.

With these views, thus rapidly and not fully presented, I think this Conference may hopefully press forward in their noble and humane scheme for the peaceful arbitration of controversies between nations, assuring this and future generations that war need never be resorted to between them in respect to any ordinary collision of rights. It will be pardoned if I add that if collisions do grow from conflicts of national policies, it will not imperil peace unless the ambition of rulers for territorial expansion or for imperial glory shall make either country forget that, under God's providence, the principal function of each is to secure for its people their liberties, their constitutional rights, and the prosecution by the citizens each of their lawful and peaceful occupations for domestic happiness, for the comfort and welfare of families, for the culture and education of all, for their moral and religious duties, each man sitting under his own vine and fig tree, where none shall molest him nor make him afraid. Let the people teach their rulers not to seek national glory by exhausting and bloody wars, but the achievement of the true glory of every people in the victories of peace over selfish greed, the domination of wicked rulers and the schemes of ambition which offer hecatombs of victims upon the altar of the Moloch of cruel and needless war.

Let me close by expressing my grateful satisfaction in being permitted to present these convictions of my life in

favor of a policy which shall make my country free, prosperous, and happy, a policy which, flinging away ambition, the sin by which the angels fell, will make the government of these United States a model of justice in its dealings with all nations, a faithful defender of the rights and liberties of the people, and an example for all mankind of a prosperous, peaceful and glorious republic of republics. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: More than two centuries ago, when this fair capitol of the nation, with its great dome, and with the flag of our country floating above it, did not exist, and when the untouched forests of centuries were growing along the banks of the Potomac, a clergyman on the shores of the North Sea said to his little flock:

"Men, brethren, sisters, children dear,
God calls us hence from over sea,
We may not dwell by Haarlem Meer,
Nor build along the Zuyder Zee."

That little flock departed, and over the stormy waves of the Atlantic found its rest, if it could be called such, upon the rock-bound coasts of Massachusetts Bay. And soon after, and among the first of its work for liberty and for progress, it established an institution which, through all these centuries, has been a bulwark of liberty, literature, progress, a fountain that has sent over all the continent of States its beneficent streams. To-night I have the pleasure of presenting to you, as the next speaker, the President of Harvard College, who is now carrying on its great work, — Dr. Charles W. Eliot.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ELIOT.

Mr. President, Members of the Conference, Ladies and Gentlemen: I cannot bring you, like so many of the speakers who have addressed you, a learned essay on international law such as we have just listened to with so much pleasure from an authoritative voice. I must speak to you without preparation, as a plain American citizen, who thinks about public problems, who has read some history of his own and other countries, and who loves his country. You remind me, sir, in your introduction, that I cannot help speaking also for an ancient institution of our land, — for Harvard University. I will say, in the first place, that Harvard University has as little reason as any institution in our country to feel an irrational and exaggerated dread of war. It has survived many wars. Ever since Minister Atherton, a graduate of its first class in 1642, fought the Indians at Deerfield, the graduates of Harvard University have been taking part in war after war, till we come down to the twelve hundred graduates who entered the army and navy of the United States in the civil war. The chief building of the University commemorates one hundred and fifty of those men, who laid down their lives for the country. French wars, Indian wars, two English wars, have gone on in the immediate neighborhood of the college. When Lord Percy marched his men to re-enforce Major Pitcairn retreating from Lexington, they went by the college gate. When the little band of raw militia were paraded on the green in front of the University on the evening before the battle of Bunker Hill, — the men who were to throw up the entrenchments on Bunker Hill, — the President of Harvard College made the prayer before them which the Puritan spirit demanded should be made by and with men who were to offer their lives. The British army was within three miles. The leading patriots of the day in Boston and Cambridge really took in their hands "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." All the build-

ings of Harvard College were occupied for months by the patriot army besieging Boston. The corporation of the college, working under the same charter to-day which was given in 1650, has been through crisis after crisis, industrial, financial, agricultural, trying to keep together the little funds which were given, from the very start of the college, for the promotion of learning. These crises, these financial difficulties, supervene invariably upon war. Many and many a one has the college been through. We have had full experience, in two hundred and fifty years of war and its consequences to institutions of education and religion. And yet, as the last speaker has just said, Harvard University knows by its observation, by its experience, that heroic virtue may be plucked by noble souls from all the desolation and carnage and agony of war. We know too, that even from unjust war, like the Mexican war, a nation may win undeserved advantages. Therefore, when we plead for arbitration, we do not necessarily deny that war has its greatness, and that out of it may come permanent good for the great forces of human society. But we also know that to produce war,—with a belligerent public policy deliberately to produce war, can only be compared to deliberately and by intention introducing a pestilence into the population, in order forsooth, that thousands of victims should have the opportunity of dying bravely and with resignation, and that some noble souls, nurses, doctors, mothers, should have the opportunity to develop and display heroic qualities. One process is just as reasonable as the other. Never, never, let us hear it maintained in our country that war should be deliberately advocated and produced, in order that we may exhibit, in a few souls, great qualities in resistance to hideous evil! (Applause.)

What shall we say about carelessness, inattention, to those insidious causes which in their development may produce war? I believe that it is just an apprehension of that carelessness, that inattention to the risks of public policy which may lead to war, which has brought this Conference together. We have seen in the public press some remarks, presumably by a graduate of Harvard University (for every possible opinion is developed among the graduates of that numerous institution);—we have seen some remarks about the inopportune of this assembly. I shall venture to say some words upon that subject. Why have we come together at this time? It is, I believe, because we, like other thoughtful American citizens, have been surprised and astonished at the risk of war which we have lately incurred. Only four months ago a message of the President of the United States seemed, to thousands of men in this and other countries, a grave threat of the execution, through our public forces and by all means at our disposal, of a compulsory arbitration to be entered into by two other nations. We learned with astonishment, shortly after, that, months before, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, as he would be called in other countries,—the Secretary of State,—had issued papers from this capital, of most threatening tenor, which, in contests between individuals, would perhaps have been fairly called exasperating. Between gentlemen, what is the nature of the statement, from the stronger man, "My fiat shall be law between us"? These sentiments, conveyed in public documents, took thousands of thoughtful Americans by surprise. That surprise, that shock, were, I dare say, unintended, but they were inevitable from the tone of the papers. And then we had another surprise. We thought that the separation of the executive and legislative functions in our

country had one great advantage on which we could rely, namely, that when executive propositions of a grave and serious nature were laid before the legislative branches, the legislative branch might be depended upon to give consideration and procure delay. We have been painfully surprised to learn by the actual fact that that reliance is not well founded. Moreover we have seen a new phenomenon in our country, and perhaps in the world,—namely, the greatly increased inflammability of a multitudinous population in consequence of the development of telegraph, telephone and daily press. I think that fairly describes the phenomenon of four months ago,—greatly increased inflammability, in consequence of these applications on a new and broader scale of inventions quite within this century. And then we have another new phenomenon, new to our country, in this fact,—that it has become, quite within recent years, the practice to employ as cabinet officers men who have not had legislative experience, or experience in any branch of our government, before taking these important places. One reason of that is that senatorships are so much more attractive than cabinet places; but be the reason what it may, this has introduced into our governmental system a new and serious danger, the danger of inexperience in high places, the danger of bringing in men from business, from the controversial, contentious profession of the law, suddenly into great public functions.

Beside these revelations of the last four months, there is another reason why thoughtful Americans are giving themselves great concern about the means of interposing obstacles in the way of sudden movement toward war. We have seen, during the last eight or ten years, in both political parties, and perhaps as much in one as the other, the importation from Europe of an idea, a policy, absolutely new among us, absolutely repugnant to all American public experience,—an importation from the aristocratic and military nations of Europe. I refer, of course, to this modern American notion called "Jingoism,"—a detestable word, gentlemen, used in naming a detestable thing! (Applause.) I should be utterly at a loss to state which party in this country has been most guilty of this monstrosity. (Applause.) And I should be obliged to confess, if inquired of by any observant person in this audience, that among the worst offenders in this respect are to be found sundry graduates of Harvard University. (Laughter.) If we look at this importation for a moment, what can be clearer than that it is an offensive foreign importation, against which, unfortunately, our protection has been inadequate. The term is of English origin, and not from the best side of English politics, but from the worst,—from the politics of Palmerston and Disraeli and not of Gladstone. (Applause.) It is the most abject copy conceivable, gentlemen, of a pernicious foreign ideal, and yet some of my friends endeavor to pass it off upon the American people as patriotic Americanism. A more complete delusion, a more complete misrepresentation, cannot be imagined. The whole history of the American people is adverse to this European notion. This people has always advocated the rights of neutrals, arbitration, peaceful settlement. It has always contributed more than any other nation to the development of the methods of arbitration. It has contributed more than any other nation to the promotion of peace among the nations of the earth. What other nation has gone without a standing army? What other nation has had a perfectly insignificant fleet? What great Christian nation, I mean, has exhibited this reliance upon

the strength of peace? Can anything be more offensive to the sober-minded, industrious, laborious classes of American society than this doctrine of "jingoism," this chip-on-the-shoulder attitude, this attitude of a ruffian and a bully? That is just what jingoism means, gentlemen, coupled with a brutal and despotic militarism which naturally exists in countries where the government has been despotic or aristocratic, and where there has always been an enormous military class, but which is absolutely foreign to American society. (Applause.) The teaching of this doctrine by our press and some of our public men is one of the reasons why this Conference has gathered now. We want to teach just the other doctrine. We want to set forth, in the daily and the periodical press, by publications of our own, by the representations of a standing committee, what is the true American doctrine on this subject. As one of the speakers said this afternoon, we want to have the children of this country, the young men rising up into places of authority and influence, taught what the true American doctrine of peace has been, what the true reliance of a strong, free nation should be, — not on force of arms, but on the force of righteousness. (Applause.)

The moment is opportune, gentlemen, for the inculcation of these doctrines. We have escaped a serious danger, but thoughtful men should say, "We will now make our preparation that we may have a new security for peace, — namely, a preconceived, pre-arranged, established treaty of arbitration." (Applause.) That it is which this meeting has come together to support, to maintain, to inculcate as a duty and a privilege of the American people.

I can hardly conceive, gentlemen, that any person who has read the history of our country should arrive at any other conclusion with regard to its natural mission. And yet, even in this very Conference, one gentleman arose to say that we had a mission to carry our ideas over the world, to spread our ideas of free institutions, of self-government, among the peoples of the earth, and that like England, we should have a force with which to do it, — that we should have a navy, and guns and forts on our own seaboard to resist aggression, — that with armed forces we should carry over the world the public principles of liberty for which our nation stands. Now, gentlemen, I believe that this nation has a mission in the world, a noble mission. But it is not to carry by force of arms to the people of the earth the blessings of liberty and self-government; — not by force of arms, but first by taking in the peoples of the earth to our own land and there teaching them the blessings of liberty. Have not we done that? Eighteen millions strong they have come; all of us came within two hundred and fifty years. And this great nation has taught the principles of self-government, freedom, and peace, to all the seventy millions that now inhabit this continental territory. There is only one other means by which we should teach these principles to men. It is by example, — by the example of happiness and prosperity wrought, through practical living, out of freedom and peace. Never should we advocate the extension of our institutions by force of arms, either on sea or on land! (Applause.)

I naturally think, gentlemen, of the educational object of this meeting. I trust that in all our colleges and universities and through all our public schools, these principles which I have just stated may be taught, — indeed, have been taught, are taught, — as the true American

doctrine on this subject. One speaker this afternoon mentioned one particular detail in which he thought instruction should be given throughout our land. He said: "We have been taught in our schools about the battles of our nation; we have not been taught about the arbitrations of our nation." Let us teach to the children the rational, sober-minded, righteous mode of settling international difficulties. Let us teach them, that war often does not settle them, that arbitration always does. Let us teach them that what is rational, reasonable, righteous between man and man should be made rational, reasonable, righteous between nation and nation. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: *Ladies and Gentlemen:*—It is not yet quite two thousand years since the real progress of mankind began, — religious and social progress, progress in charity and justice among men. Nearly, if not quite, fourteen hundred years of that progress has been chiefly carried on and maintained, as it is still in one line, by the Roman Catholic Church. (Applause.) I am not a member of that communion, but of another communion that I believe to be the Catholic Church; but that is a matter of opinions and methods and details. But that ancient church, in civilized countries and in savage countries, among the poor and the servile, the destitute and the ignorant, has been all this time carrying on the mission of peace, of religion, of social progress, and virtue among its people. And as a representative of that great institution, I am glad to present to you BISHOP KEANE, the Chief of the Catholic University of Washington.

ADDRESS OF BISHOP KEANE.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am most grateful for the very kind words with which I have been introduced, words concerning the grand old Church of which I have the honor of being a humble child. They are true words; she has always been on the side of human progress, because she was sent forth to do her work by Him at whose birth it was proclaimed that not only was glory to be given to God, but peace was to be bestowed upon mankind.

I am glad to have the opportunity this evening to appear, not only in the name of the Catholic University of America, but I might say in the name of all Catholics in the United States and of the grand old Church to which we all belong, in order from the depth of my heart and of their hearts to endorse the movement represented by this peace Conference. (Applause.) And I am requested to say how sorry two of my friends are, that they cannot be here to say some words, — Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland; they would be glad to be here, and they have asked me to speak in their name. (Applause.)

Who that is a man, and especially who that is a Christian or a believer in religion at all, could fail to sympathize with the cause which this Conference represents? Eminent statesmen and economists have discoursed to you on the practical facts which demonstrate the disastrousness of war and the desirableness of making arbitration a substitute in settling the quarrels of the nations. Let me ask you to glance at the subject in the light of the principles which constitute us men and Christians.

As long as men are men, limited in intelligence and biased by selfish interests, there will be disputes between men and nations. But men and nations are bound to settle their disputes in a human, that is in a reasonable manner.

Brutes settle their disputes with tooth and claw, savages settle them with bludgeon and tomahawk. Men that cannot claim the excuse of savage ignorance are bound by the eternal law of their being to settle them by the rule of truth and justice.

But it may be asked, Who is to decide what is truth and justice but the parties concerned? Not at all. Good sense and justice declare that no man is to be judge in his own cause. One of the first principles of civilization, of the social organization of human beings on the basis of reason, is that disputes should be settled by the sentence of a competent and disinterested judge. Mere individualism, the system of "every man for himself," is excluded by the very rudiments of civilization. And could we for one moment imagine that such a system of savagery could be right as between nations, when it is manifestly wrong as between individuals that compose nations? Far from it. The greater majesty of the nation imposes all the wider obligation of acting in all things by the direction of enlightened reason, in nothing by the impulse of savage violence and brute power. Self-defence is indeed a universally accepted right. But even the right of self-defence is amenable to law and order. It is only under the pressure of exceptional necessity that it may take law in its own hands, and assert justice or repel wrong by its own strength. All things must be done according to order when they are done rightly.

Militarism was introduced into the world by the greed for plunder, by the outgrowth of lust of conquest, and by the consequent need of self-defence. Such causes and their sad effect would naturally be eliminated by the advance of civilization. But there are kindred causes ever at work, which have thus far maintained militarism as the disgrace and the curse of civilization. Cæsarism sees in militarism the tool of its ambition, the rampart of its tyranny. But the civilized world is sick of Cæsarism. (Applause.)

The great providential tide of democracy and liberty is moving irresistibly onward, and with Cæsarism, militarism must go. (Applause.) It has been upheld by the spirit of nationalistic exclusiveness, by that fell spirit, the curse of the Old World in past ages, which has made men suspect and hate one another, century after century, because they were born on opposite sides of a river or of an imaginary boundary line. But of that, too, the world is growing sick and tired. (Applause.) Our country has shown mankind that men of all nationalities, coming from countries armed to the teeth against each other for centuries, can meet and mingle as fellow-men, as fellow-citizens, and blend into a united and homogeneous people. Our country is giving the keynote of the future; everywhere the cry is for the federation of the nations, the brotherhood of mankind. (Applause.) The demand, the movement, is irresistible, and with the insane spirit of narrow nationalism, militarism must go. (Applause.) It has been upheld by the very spirit which has impelled men to hate one another; and, alas! with shame and sorrow we have to acknowledge that men of hate have been cunning in using every motive, even the purest and noblest and holiest, as the incentives to the spirit of faction and sect, as incentives to make men suspect and ostracize and hate and kill one another, for the love of country, forsooth,—yea, for the love of God! As Americans we blush to have to acknowledge that even in our own land of equal rights, of civil and religious liberty, of universal brotherhood, the hiss of that serpent head is

occasionally heard, and its fangs may deal blows in the dark. The trail of that serpent is over all history, and its venom has had much to do with the sanguinary wars and the deep-rooted militarism of the past. But the world is sick of it. Only vile or fanatic souls now side with it. The spirit of mutual hatred is from below, shameful and unworthy, and must pass away; and in its slimy folds may it drag militarism with it. (Applause.)

We look to a higher ideal, to Him who was foretold as the Prince of Peace, to Him at whose birth the angels proclaimed, "Peace on earth to men of good will," to Him whose salutation was ever, "Peace be with you!" to Him whose legacy was, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give you," to Him who said, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if you love one another. (Applause.) This is the spirit of Christian civilization, for nations as for individuals. The world is meant to be governed and, assuredly must yet be governed, not by hatred and violence and might, but by love and justice and right. Nothing else can be lasting and permanently successful. Justice alone is mighty, love alone is everlasting, truth alone can ultimately prevail. For these are the spirit of the eternal God. What is propped by the cannon and bayonets must topple over at last; only truth and justice are immovable and remain forever.

But how, it will be asked, can so exalted an ideal be realized among men? Considering the panorama of blood and carnage presented by history; considering that at this moment the most civilized nations of the earth are armed to the teeth as if for universal war, and only clamor in their parliaments for stronger and stronger armaments; considering that even in our own country the war-spirit has lately been so rife, and that the most imperative and most popular demand just now is for more army, more navy, more and more enginery of offence and defence;—considering all this, how do sensible people expect that the era of hatred and violence can be brought to a close, and the era of justice and peace inaugurated? The answer is manifest: only through such a system of international arbitration as is here proposed. (Applause.) The system of courts, so wisely provided in every civilized country for settling disputes among the citizens, must manifestly be extended to the nations for settling differences among them. The quarrels of the nations must be settled, not like those of pulling and scratching children, but like those of reasonable grown-up men, by equity and law. Not the brawl nor the duel nor the feud, but the court must be the resort of nations as of men. Every one knows that this is true. The nations recognize it in their hearts. They arm for conflict simply because there is no such court before which their quarrels can be brought. If there were, then very shame of the principles and methods of savagery would soon coerce them to disarmament. Our own country has recently been forced to face the possibility of war, not because she desires it, but simply because there is no court to which national quarrels must be brought. And men who love peace have been compelled to say to our country, "Go to war, if you needs must for the sake of principle," simply because as things are, there is no other established means for the assertion of international principles or the maintenance of international right.

I am not here to blame the President; I am not here to blame the Congress. I do not believe that it is the pur-

pose or the right of this Conference to blame either of them. (Applause.) But we, as free American citizens, are free to say to President and to Congress that it is a pity that things in the wide world should be as they are, compelling the Congress and the executive of a nation like this to talk war to a civilized fellow-nation. (Applause.) Things should not be left as they are; it is a shame that they are such now, at the close of the nineteenth century. It will be a far greater shame if we leave them such for the twentieth. (Applause.)

The difficulties of the reform are no reason why it should not be attempted. Any fool or poltroon can conjure up difficulties. The duty of the wise and the brave is to face difficulties, and with mingled prudence and strength to overcome them. There will assuredly be difficulties, and serious ones, in the devising and organizing of a system of international judiciary, difficulties in the establishment of the tribunal or tribunals to which the nations can safely trust the settlement of their disputes; difficulties as to the international police power that will be necessary to enforce sentences. For the tribunals of the world have not yet learned, and probably never will learn, to dispense with the strong arm. But these difficulties are certainly not insuperable. Let international good will and international good sense once take the problem resolutely in hand, and difficulties will disappear, or gradually find their solution. There is more calm good will and more practical good sense in the English-speaking races than in all the races of the world put together. (Applause.) In God's name, let them take the problem resolutely in hand now, and the nations of the world will yet call them blessed. (Applause.)

DR. CHAMBERLAIN called the attention of the Conference to a cordial letter which had been received by the committee of arrangements from Cardinal Gibbons.

THE PRESIDENT: *Ladies and Gentlemen*:—It was one hundred and fifty years ago, — a long time in the life of this nation, young in years and yet so old and strong in all the influence and interests that promote the welfare of mankind, — that there was established near the shores of the Delaware, in the present State of New Jersey, then a province of the King of England, another institution of learning than that of old Harvard, an institution that was sending forth its influences of education and social knowledge at the time when Washington and his weary but brave and persistent soldiers were crossing the Delaware, in the midst of floating ice, to assert and maintain the liberties of the independent colonies. That institution, during all these years, has been sending forth, like Harvard, in streams permeating every part of the continent, the same influence that old Harvard has done, — influences upon which rest, and upon which only can rest, the safety of a government of the people. That ancient institution still stands. The blue Delaware flows near its doors, and carries to the sea the same limpid waters of purity from its mountain sources that this ancient institution still continues to give to the people of the United States. I may hope that as the Delaware carries to the sea the purity of its waters, this great and venerable institution will continue to carry to the great ocean of human progress the purity, the learning and the strength that it always has carried. I am glad to introduce to you my friend President Patton of Princeton University.

ADDRESS OF DR. PATTON.

Gentlemen of the Conference, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I do not know that I can in any way illuminate the subject you are considering; but I cannot deprive myself of the privilege of placing myself on record, and also of placing on record the institution that I serve, as in most hearty sympathy with the object for which this Conference is called. The college over which I preside played an important part in the Revolutionary struggle, and had no little place in making the constitution of the United States. The only college president whose name is attached to the Declaration of Independence was the president of Princeton, and his name was Witherspoon. (Applause.) Most of you know the place that Madison and Patterson and Oliver Ellsworth occupied in the constitutional history of the United States. It is only necessary for me to say, — I say it with feelings of pride, — that they were Princeton men. It is, I confess, to me a matter of gratification that I cannot conceal, that since Princeton occupied such a place in the opening chapter of the history of this American nation, her voice should be heard to-night, in connection with a movement which, we all hope, is opening still another chapter in the same history. I could only wish that one who has a better right to be heard were her representative this evening; for I realize very fully that in order to deal adequately with this subject one should be a jurist, familiar at least with diplomacy. Yet I cannot forget, as a sort of justification of my position here, that one of the earliest treatises in this country on international law was written by a clergyman; his name was President Woolsey; and that one of the latest treatises coming to us from the English press is written by a clergyman, — I refer to the recent work of Professor Lawrence, and I refer to it all the more because of the conspicuous place which he gives to an arbitral tribunal in his very interesting pages. (Applause.)

I think, after all, that the lawyers ought not to monopolize this business of international law; because, unless I greatly err, it has been a common thing with lawyers to disparage the department altogether. It certainly has been the case with the English jurists; they have tolerated it, they have recognized it in a way, but they have been careful to say that, strictly speaking, it is not law, and that if you are to be really accurate in your terminology, it belongs more to the department of moral philosophy. (Laughter.) We will take them at their word in this respect; and I concede that there is an element of truth in what they say, if they say that there is no sovereign power of which this international law is the expression, and that there is no way of carrying into effect the decisions of this law through any international sovereign power. Indeed, one of the objections, — and reference has been made to them very frequently, — to the whole matter of arbitration, is that in the event of a party being unwilling to accept an unwelcome suggestion, there is no sovereign power to compel. I do not know that it would do us much good if there were a power able to compel, for I do not see how a nation could be compelled except at the point of the bayonet, and it would be a little like a contradiction in terms if we should proceed to secure a peaceful settlement of international disputes, and to say at the same time that the nation which would not accept peaceably the result of arbitration should be compelled to do so by force of arms. And this leads me to say that the only hope for the successful carrying out of the purpose for which this Conference is called lies in the development, — perhaps I

ought to say, in deference to the language of science, in the gradual evolution, of an international conscience. (Laughter.) And in saying this I would make my reply to those who tell us that there is no way by which the decisions of international law can be enforced, — in other words, that the law is without a sanction. There are more sanctions than one; for grosser natures the only sanction recognized is the penalty, — the fine or imprisonment, but for more refined natures the social ostracism or disapproval or the cold shoulder, is quite as effective. And it is this quasi-social sanction which we recognize as operative in the community of individuals, which we are to fall back upon as operative ultimately in the community of nations. (Applause.) When society shall have reached that point when the nation will not dare to risk the contempt of its sister nations, international law will have a sanction, and the decisions of international law will be enforced. The only question, therefore, is whether there is any likelihood, in our day, that this international conscience shall be evolved.

There is no question that war is an undesirable thing, there is no question that the settlement of international disputes by arbitration is a desirable thing. We need not discuss that question. Nor is it a new thing for individual men, perhaps a little in advance of other men, to say that it is a consummation devoutly to be wished, — this international arbitration. The question is whether there is enough of this sort of sentiment to go round. (Laughter.)

The question is, whether human society, in any considerable quantity, is so permeated with this idea that the idea can become regnant. And in order that we may entertain optimistic opinions upon this subject, perhaps it were worth our while to see whether this Conference is, after all, not a symptom of a prevailing tendency, and whether, in the existence of this prevailing tendency we do not see the best reason for hoping for the fulfilment of our expectations and the realization of our desire.

There are two or three ideas which seem to point hopefully in the direction that we desire. In the first place, there never was a time when the thoughts of men were turned so generally as they are now turned to the science of human society. (Applause.) This organization is what men are looking at, more than they are looking at the individuals that make the organism. They understand that the organism called human society is made up of men and women, with hopes and fears and aspirations, and the consideration of them becomes, so far as individual men and women are concerned, the science which they call ethics. They understand that when these units that make up the organism come together, they must come together upon some basis that will serve as some protection against disturbances within and foes without, and so they get their science of politics or government. They understand that if government is set up it becomes necessary that there shall be a set of restrictions and prohibitions, and that these fall into certain categories; and the scientific exhibition of this is what they call their science of jurisprudence. They understand that when you have human society set up, with a government and with a set of laws, the industrial forces are ready to work, and society moves on in accordance with the laws that regulate these industrial forces; and the scientific exhibition of these laws is what we call political economy. They understand perfectly well that in spite of

all the machinery we have set up, as a part of the consequence of this very industrial competition, there are certain pathological conditions in society, — a great deal of sickness and poverty and distress and vice; and they come to consider what we shall do. For when you have your anatomy and your physiology and your pathology, the next question is, "What are you going to do about it?" And the consideration of all these questions, I suppose, if the science should ever be evolved that would embrace it all, ought to be called the science of sociology; and that is the science to which the attention of so many people, in increasing numbers, is being called at this particular moment. And when we look at human society in this way, we find out that the word "man" is a bigger word than the word "Englishman." (Applause.) We find that this world is a great vicinage, we find that every man is a brother, and that the movement in the direction of arbitration and the suppression of hostilities is simply the logical outcome of this great movement in the direction of the study of human society.

And again, there is going on, in an increased ratio all the time, the moralization of society. This means not only, or even chiefly, that the conscience of the individual is becoming more acute and discriminating with reference to departures from the rule of rectitude; but it means that men are coming to understand that the laws of morality applicable to the individual, are likewise as applicable to the organism. There is danger in this, because there is always danger when you undertake to enforce morality upon the individual through the exercise of sovereign power. There is danger in the direction of state socialism; but there is good in it, and the good in it is leading to the abolition of slavery, to the equality of the sexes before the law, and it is leading likewise to movements looking toward the suppression of hostilities between nations. (Applause.)

And then, in the third place, there is an ever-increasing complexity of commercial relationships between the nations of the world, so that from an expedient point of view it does not pay to fight, and credits become strong arguments for arbitration and peaceful settlement. That is not the only phase of it; there is a moral side to the industrial activities of the world. The economic factors in life constitute so large and important a part in the arithmetic of life that when we have learned that a certain course of conduct is noted as wise and expedient, in the right economic direction, morality immediately commends it in the name of all that is right. And this is another reason working in the direction that we are looking for, to wit, the settlement of international difficulties by peaceful means.

And, once more, there is an increasing democratization of government among the peoples of the earth. (Applause.) Now it would make but little difference if individuals were becoming more moral and society were rising in the ethical level, if a king with his army at his back settled the question as to whether war should be begun or whether it should cease. But when the question as to whether the war should be begun or not is a question to be settled by the suffrages of the people, it becomes an immensely important thing that the people, individually and collectively, are becoming moralized more and more and day by day, so that the long and the short of it is that men are coming to understand, in the first place, that war is unnecessary and inexpedient, and in the sec-

ond place that war is wrong, and in the third place that we need not have it, if we do not want it, and in the fourth place that we do not want it. (Applause.) These are the reasons for our being hopeful, these are the grounds for our optimistic views with respect to the adoption of the views of this Conference.

Now, tell me the nation in which these conditions are best realized to-day. Tell me the nations that are making most of the study of the science of human society. Tell me whether it is not in the three or four hundred colleges of this land; tell me whether it is not in Great Britain and Ireland. Tell me where the moral life has reached its highest point, and where conscience is most active and most discriminating and most effectual in its pronouncements with respect to right and wrong. Tell me the nations that are in closest commercial relationship. Tell me the nations that best illustrate the democratic spirit. This is a democratic country and England is a democratic country. Are not these two nations, which happen to be bound together by ties of blood, are not these two nations, which possess a common language and a common law and a common literature and a common religion, the two nations precisely which best illustrate, — if they are not the only nations which illustrate, — the four great conditions which we have laid down as essential to the realization of any scheme looking toward peaceful settlement of international disputes? We do well, I think, to begin this new era of modern civilization by asking Great Britain and the United States to join hands in an effort to suppress war, and to settle international disputes through a mode of arbitration. Can we entertain any other idea than that this hope will be realized? Is there any one so blind that he cannot see that if these two nations would agree in this thing, and would then join hands in aggressive efforts to spread the kingdom of righteousness and peace, that they would give control to the moral forces of this wide world? (Applause.)

DR. CHAMBERLAIN: There are certain very delightful obligations resting on us, and I have asked MR. ROBERT TREAT PAINE of Boston to rise, that the opportunity of discharging one of those obligations might be secured without intruding upon the peaceful serenity of our presiding officer. I will ask JUDGE DALY of New York to express the sentiments of this Conference concerning our presiding officer and his service to us in those two days.

JUDGE DALY: *Ladies and Gentlemen:*—I have had very pleasant and satisfactory things in connection with public affairs during a long life, but I have had none more grateful to myself and I think none that will be more fully appreciated by the audience present, than to discharge this duty. A large number of the ladies and gentlemen who are here present have not attended our meetings, which were of a business character, and they have not had the opportunity which I, and those who were associated with me have had, of observing the dignity, the moderation, the broadness, the system, and the thoroughness with which the duty of the chairman of a public meeting of this character has been performed. Never, in my judgment, has it been discharged with more satisfaction to all persons present. I will assume that everybody is of my opinion; and therefore I propose a vote of thanks to the distinguished gentleman who has presided over our Conference.

The vote being taken, the response was so unanimous and hearty that Judge Daly concluded:

I am now entirely satisfied that you are of my opinion.

MR. PAINE: This meeting ought not to be brought to a close without a few words of grateful recognition from the members of this Conference, gathered here from our whole country, expressing their hearty appreciation of the services which our Washington committee have rendered to this cause of international arbitration. (Applause.) I am delighted to have the privilege, in a single word, of asking you to join with me, and to allow me in these few words to express in your behalf, what I know it would please you better if each of you could yourselves express, our thanks to the committee of our Washington friends who have gathered this Conference together, who have done this acceptable work in behalf of the cause so dear to us all, and never so full of promise, as we believe, as it is to-night. Therefore, with great pleasure I offer this motion:

That the thanks of this Conference be tendered to the Washington committee, for their great services in behalf of this cause of international arbitration. (Applause.)

The motion was carried unanimously.

DR. CHAMBERLAIN: As one connected with the affairs of the Conference, and in behalf of the Committee on Business, I very heartily and sincerely propose the thanks of this Conference to the railroads for their courtesy and their cordial concessions. You will allow me to say that that concession, made without precedent, to a body of the numbers of our own, was granted by the railway traffic association, largest in this whole land, in these words: "On account of the exceptional national and international importance of the Conference, the rate is granted as follows." I therefore move the thanks of this Conference to the railroads of this country for their courtesy and concessions. And at the same time I move the thanks of the Conference to the press of this city, and especially to the United and Associated Press, for their faithful representation of this Conference to the press of the entire land.

This was also voted unanimously.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair begs leave to express his acknowledgments, most sincerely, for the kind vote that the gentlemen of the Conference have just passed in respect of the services of the Chair. The Chair could not have succeeded, even to the extent he has done, in the discharge of his duties, as so many of us met as strangers and as in the short time of our meetings, there has been very little opportunity to become personally acquainted, had it not been that every member of the Conference, composed of so many gentlemen from almost all the states of the union, has assisted the Chair by an orderly, disciplined, regular course, as if they had been trained parliamentarians, in carrying on in peace and quietness and sobriety the great concern that we have had in hand, to promote the welfare of the nations of the world. The Chair can say, with entire sincerity, that although he had had some experience in public affairs, although he has been honored far beyond his capacity or his deserts, he can say, I repeat, with entire sincerity that he has never felt that he has received so high an honor as that of presiding over this Conference for peace among men. (Applause.)

And in now closing the proceedings of this Conference, the Chair thinks it right, in the name of you all, as he thinks he safely may, to say that we owe, in the very highest degree, our grateful thanks to Mr. Dodge and to Dr. Chamberlain and the other gentlemen who in New York have been so diligent and earnest and persistent in calling the attention of the intelligent and upright people of the

STATE OF OHIO, CITY OF TOLEDO, } ss.
LUCAS COUNTY.

FRANK J. CHENEY makes oath that he is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & Co., doing business in the City of Toledo, County and State aforesaid, and that said firm will pay the sum of ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS for each and every case of CATARRH that cannot be cured by the use of HALL'S CATARRH CURE.

FRANK J. CHENEY.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence, this 6th day of December, A. D. 1886.

{SEAL.}

A. W. GLEASON,

Notary Public.

Hall's Catarrh Cure is taken internally and acts directly on the blood and mucous surfaces of the system. Send for testimonials, free.

F. J. CHENEY & Co., Toledo, O.

☞ Sold by Druggists, 75c.

WANTED.

A man or a widow to buy a fourth or a half interest in a first class Hotel business, 160 rooms, half hour ride from San Francisco, Cal. Price, \$4,000 or \$7,500 cash. This is a rare chance. Address, enclosing stamp for reply,

GEO. B. REYNOLDS,

8 First St., Louisville, Ky.

Ripans Tabules.

Ripans Tabules: at druggists.

Ripans Tabules cure nausea.

Ripans Tabules cure dizziness.

Ripans Tabules cure headache.

Ripans Tabules cure flatulence.

Ripans Tabules cure dyspepsia.

Ripans Tabules assist digestion.

Ripans Tabules cure bad breath.

Ripans Tabules cure biliousness.

United States to the purpose of this Conference and to the means that we have adopted for the promotion of what we have met here to do.

There is another thing to be said, and it is one, I think, of importance to say. There has been no great movement in the progress of the world for good, that has been accomplished by temporary or spasmodic means. The triumph of truth, the triumph of education, the triumph of peace so far as it has gone,—in short, the real Christian progress of the world is only to be attained by persistent endeavor. (Applause.) Some of the great cities, as we have seen in our own country in recent years, have found themselves tyrannized by misgovernment. At last Democrats, Republicans, Roman Catholics, Protestants, everybody who had the real good of their country and their city at heart, have forgotten for the moment the bias of sectarianism, the bias of politics, the interests of selfish business, and have united to set their heel upon the tyranny that existed over them, and have crushed it. (Applause.) Then, alas, these good men and true, of all these sects and persuasions, seemed to feel that the millenium had come, and I the Republican departed to my party again, and you the Democrat to yours, and you Protestant to your church and you Catholic to yours, and we supposed that we had achieved a permanent triumph for good government and for real progress. In a half dozen years your fort of sand has disappeared in the overwhelming waves of a new sea of corruption, and you have to begin all over again. Now I wish to impress upon

you, my friends,—and you ladies as well, for you are the chief sources of progress in society (applause)—that the work of the faithful soldier for human progress and human rights is a work that does not end yesterday which is gone, to-day which passes, or to-morrow which never comes, but is perpetual. There is no sleep for the workers for truth and justice and purity and right in society. And so I am glad that this Conference has appointed a permanent and a large executive committee, to continue to propagate the idea that is so well set forth in the resolutions which you have adopted.

And in conclusion, gentlemen of the Conference, I beg to hope with all my heart that you have enjoyed this visit to this great capital of this great nation, and that you will return to your homes with a refreshed spirit and with a renewed hope that the work you have done in these two days will be the seed of a tree that shall at last overspread the earth.

W. P. Derby, Commander of Massachusetts Department of the G. A. R., recently issued the following admirable circular to the Posts of the State:

Comrades:—Because I place such a high estimate upon the personality, the historic valor, and the patriotic purpose of the comradeship of the Department of Massachusetts, G. A. R., I direct attention to the subject matter contained in this circular and call upon you for decisive action. Massachusetts has always been foremost in every laudable work for our country and for the welfare of our race; its leadership has carried with it the prestige of wisdom and of success. We stood by its colors in time of war; let us magnify and hold up its principles in time of peace.

“Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war,” and the greatest victory of peace offered for man to achieve is that of International Arbitration.

Why should the Grand Army of the Republic favor International Arbitration?

First. Because we know of war by a personal experience and in speaking will command the respect of the world as no other organization can. We know of sentry and picket duty; the toil of the exhausting march, the roar of cannon; of the bloody havoc of bullets, minies and the bursting shell. We have faced the fire of death to the cannon's mouth, met the fierce charge, fallen bleeding and mangled upon riven fields; pined in hospital and suffered in prison pen. We left 400,000 comrades sacrificed in war, sent home 300,000 sisters and orphans dressed in the garb of mourning for those lost upon the field of carnage. We have seen the animosities engendered by war, know its fearful cost in men and means by which the country is impoverished and no one can add aught to our knowledge of it.

Second. “Let us have peace” was the word of our illustrious Commander, Gen. U. S. Grant. He was profoundly convinced that war, as an arbitrator of National differences, was a terrible crime against humanity, civilization and the age. It supplants statesmanship, law and principle, and enthrones passion, brute force and disorder to determine right and justice.

Third. The time is opportune, while jurists, statesmen and the moral forces of the English-speaking nations are deeply interested in this supreme remedy. Let our Order speak and urge its universal application through appropriate means to all grave National differences.